

The
Nineteenth Century

VOL. — 9

1881

Sas.
Librarian

Uttarpara Joykrishna Public Library
Govt. of West Bengal

THE
NINETEENTH
CENTURY.

No. XLVII.—JANUARY 1881.

*THE DAWN OF A REVOLUTIONARY
EPOCH.*

THERE have been several periods in the history of Europe when all thinking men have felt that remarkable events could not long be postponed. Even within the last hundred years the French Revolution and the great Continental movements of 1848 were preceded by changes which betokened a serious shock to existing institutions. Careful observers predicted the approach of both the one and the other, though neither took precisely the anticipated shape. But never, perhaps, has the certainty of approaching trouble, social and political, been more manifest than it is to-day.¹ The issues are more complicated than ever before, and that they can be settled without grave disturbance is scarcely credible. Of the political dangers by which Europe is threatened we hear daily. They are serious enough. With the whole Eastern Question reopened in a most dangerous shape—with Russian Pan Slavism and German ambition to reconcile—with Italian aspirations and French yearning for the lost provinces to gratify—all the nations being armed for war as they never were

¹ Since this was written, Baron Hübnér has delivered his remarkable speech in Austrian Delegations. From his ultra-Conservative point of view, he regards republican or Democratic ideas as proceeding direct from the Author of Evil, and proposes an immediate renewal of the Three Emperor League, or Holy Alliance, as the flood of revolution ere it is too late. Has not the time almost gone by for a combination of Governments against peoples?

before—it will be strange indeed if the next few years pass over peacefully. The era of redistribution of territory and power has perhaps even yet barely begun.

These matters, it is true, all lie on the surface, and are possibly susceptible of arrangement by mutual compromise or by general disarmament. But there is no appearance of this at present, and meanwhile the social danger which underlies and intensifies the political is becoming more difficult of solution each day. Those schemes for the reorganisation of society which Fourier, Saint Simon, Owen, Lassalle, Marx, and others propounded are no longer the mere dreams of impracticable theorists or the hopeless experiments of misguided enthusiasts; they have been taken down from the closet of the Utopian investigator into the street, and move vast masses of men to almost religious exasperation against their fellows. Ever and anon some accident shows what men are really thinking of; an election, a strike, a prohibited meeting give the opportunity, and we see what manner of difficulties those are which have to be faced by foreign statesmen, and which we in our turn may have to deal with here. For the questions now being discussed by hundreds of thousands on the Continent go to the very foundation of all social arrangements. It is no longer a mere barren argument about the rights of man to political representation: it is a determined struggle to change the basis of agreements which have hitherto been considered absolutely essential to the prevention of anarchy. What is more, those who hold these opinions are gaining in numbers and in strength each day, though the fear felt and expressed of their doctrines compels them to more or less of secrecy in the propaganda which they steadily carry on. Ideas which a few years ago would have caused laughter or contempt, now arouse fear and indignation, and to-morrow will stir up hatred and ferocity; for events move fast in these days, and alike in Germany, France, Italy, and Russia, not to speak of other countries, we can now see clearly that a large portion of the urban population are being surely if slowly indoctrinated with notions that cannot be put in practice save at the expense of those above and around them. Though the ideas vary with race and climate, the principle is everywhere the same, and it is one which, if pressed to its logical conclusions, must shake the whole structure of modern society.

Nor can we be altogether surprised that this should be so. In the machinery of our daily life the real producer has as yet counted for little. The crowded room, the dingy street, the smoky atmosphere, the pleasureless existence, the gradual deterioration of his offspring—these things are noted and brooded upon by men who are being steadily educated to understand the disadvantages of their position, and are also being drilled to right them. A self-sacrificing enthusiast like Delescluze does not deliberately throw away his life at the top

of a barricade for nothing; even miscreants such as Hödel and Nöbling stir men's minds to ask why they thus put themselves forward as martyrs under circumstances where they could not hope for escape. Visionary and mischievous as are their opinions, we can at least recognise that they believed in the truth of that which they professed, and that the conditions of life for the multitude do need reform, even if it be brought about by some sacrifice of the ease and comfort now the sole appanage of the wealthier classes. Once more we are brought to consider the right of man to live, and that right being granted or confirmed, that he should have the further privilege to live in such wise as not to deteriorate himself or his progeny.

It can scarcely be doubted that, in Germany at any rate, there are all the elements of a conflagration ready to hand. This has of late been so apparent that we may fairly take it into account in estimating Prince Bismarck's policy. But the growth of the party of the Social Democrats in Germany is in itself a remarkable fact in modern politics. For there alone have the theorists begun to organise themselves with a definite object, and there alone are they sufficiently educated, and, what is more to the purpose, sufficiently trained in military affairs, to be really formidable. This militarisation of the mob, however viewed, is a strange piece of business in itself. On the one hand, strong repressive measures have been passed which keep turbulent Berlin in a permanent state of siege, which render it impossible for workmen to form any union, to publish any paper, to hold any meeting to canvass for political purposes: At the same time, the factory laws which had been carried to restrain the undue employment of children, and to prevent abuse of their power by capitalists, have been gradually set aside. The pressure of the times has rendered the position still more grave than it would otherwise have been. And yet, with men thus exasperated at the denial of all freedom and the underhand suspension of laws passed with difficulty for their benefit, the military conscription is still in full force. The malcontents are passed steadily through the army exposed to the hated Prussian discipline at the hands of that hard-handed and hard-headed Junker class whom they are learning to look upon as more bitter enemies than any foreign foe, and return to their homes—such of them as do not seek refuge across the Atlantic—to remember that a million more trained soldiers hold the same opinions that they do, and await only a favourable opportunity to show their real strength.

At the polls they have been asserting themselves, and their successes are no longer confined to the capital or to the few manufacturing centres. Hartmann the shoemaker's election at Hamburg, when he polled twice as many votes as his two competitors, was more remarkable even than the mere numbers showed, for his opponents were directly antagonistic to the Socialist laws, and were

both Liberals. In the debates, Liebknecht, Bebel, Hartmann, and the other Socialist deputies, are now listened to with attention, as representing a force which has to be reckoned with henceforth as a strong political influence. They are the representatives not merely of their own cities, but of that revolt of industrialism against militarism which can in the end have but one result. Not even the Prussian bureaucracy, with its marvellous organisation, can in the long run make head against the growing discontent which is now finding voice in so many quarters. All the repressive measures in the world will not prevent men from voting under the ballot in accordance with what they really think. The desire of excluding from the polls all who had taken advantage of the free State education, did not prevent the Social Democrats from casting 600,000 votes at the last general election, nor will prevent them from largely increasing that number at the next. Persecution has but inflamed the enthusiasm of the whole party. They are now striving, not merely for the strange programme which their leaders put forward, but on behalf of that common freedom, that right to ordinary liberty, which can no longer safely be denied either to Catholics or Socialists.

But their objects are none the less clearly defined that for the moment they are hidden from our view by the blunders of the executive. That tyranny of capital which has so often been denounced as if it were an embodiment of the evil spirit in a new and dangerous shape, and which Lamennais inveighed against as the modern incarnation of the slave-driver without the slave-driver's interest in the life of his property—this it is which the Socialists are striving to overthrow. Though they recognise, in Germany at least, the family ties, they are determined, when the opportunity offers, to do away with that vast influence of individual accumulation which they look upon as wholly harmful. Thus the State, the Republic, the Municipality, the Commune, each in its way is to be the sole capitalist acting for the benefit of all. A higher ideal of duty, a nobler view of the future of mankind, will thus be brought about when each is ready to use his faculties to the fullest extent for the benefit of his fellows; when, the privilege of individual inheritance being done away, the State shall be the universal legatee, and all shall work together and in concert, where now the general advantage is endangered by the perpetual occurrence of selfish conflicts. Then, too, the education of children from their cradle to their manhood shall no longer be an accident, in which the poor become more wretched and more ignorant, the rich more luxurious and more proud. In that reign of equality the full development of human energies shall be the sole object, and general advantage the common end. The wiser heads admit that the realisation of this their materialist Utopia must be gradual, that

society is not as yet prepared to transcend all previous experience of human motives, and rise at one bound to this lofty conception of that which should be its aim. They would be content to proceed slowly, would look upon the recognition of their views as something other than mere dreams, as much already achieved. But this does not suit the fanatics of the new Socialist gospel. They hold that their day shall be to-morrow, and that the counsel to proceed slowly means at such a time mere cowardice. A social revolution, they urge, must work by violence to start with, if it is to achieve rest and thankful prosperity in the long run.

And will these more ardent ones not get the upper-hand in the storms now perhaps very close in Germany? It would be hard to answer that question with decision in the negative. The prospect seems unfavourable to moderation. Alike in the cities and in the country the proletariat might become masters of the situation for a time. For the country population in large portions of Southern Germany are not a Conservative force; they too are disaffected, they too look hopefully towards the Communistic Utopia, they too have felt and feel the pressure of militarisation and the hardness of the times. That very emigration which since 1848 has been one of the great features of modern Germany is a revolutionary movement; for the men who go are chiefly of the moderately wealthy middle class. They leave, but they do not return. They and their children remain to strengthen and enrich the Republic beyond the Atlantic, where conscription is unknown, right of meeting unfettered, and Junkerdom abhorred. The memory of the Fatherland remains, but it is a memory only, not a living anxiety to return to help on its progress or to enhance its prosperity. But this exodus has been chiefly of the middle class, and the millions who have gone have but accentuated the difference between the toiling many and the bureaucratic, aristocratic, and military few who oppress them—have too left an almost impassable gap between the wealthy landlord and the small owner or labourer, between the hand-to-mouth workman and the capitalist class. The moderate Liberals, the progressive class of Germany, having been driven away to seek their fortune amid American liberties, those who remain look to revolution rather than to steady progress to remedy their present condition.

In a late debate in the German Reichstag, one of the Socialist deputies declared plainly that, failing to modify the laws which have been enacted to crush them for the next six years, they must be driven to try force. For the moment, every effort is being made to prevent émeutes even where the oppression is the greatest. When strikes occur, the Socialist leaders in Germany and abroad urge upon their followers caution—tell them their time is not yet. In home affairs, for the present they work, wherever practicable, for

a policy of decentralisation as opposed to the centralising tendency now in favour, for individual liberty, for the fair treatment of municipalities, and the due regard to the working class in municipal affairs. But they have not much power in the Assemblies save in conjunction with those to whom in the end they must be bitterly opposed. So far it is the blundering of the Government rather than their own sagacity or political management which has improved their position. But the organisation is becoming more and more complete, and the action is taken in accordance with preconcerted arrangements. In foreign affairs, the policy of the party, with the exception of a watchful jealousy of Russia, is more sagacious than their scheme for human improvement would leave one to suppose possible. They opposed the annexation of Alsace and Lorraine not only on international grounds, as tending to perpetuate that bitter hatred between France and Germany which has for centuries been so injurious to the peoples of both countries, but also because the competition of the Alsace manufacturers would bring destruction upon the German industries, and throw more men out of work than could find employment elsewhere. The great indemnity exacted from France pushed these considerations aside for the time; but who can say now that their fears have not been realised? Even to-day the Social Democrats are probably the only people in Germany who see that it would be well for their country to make such peaceful terms with France as would result in the restoration, or at any rate the neutralisation, of the two lost provinces. Meanwhile, as has been said, education and militarisation go hand in hand together, Berlin and other cities are kept in a permanent state of siege, protection is fostered in every direction, and the very men who might be the support of the Empire are driven away or forced into secret hostility. And the man who is chiefly responsible for all this is regarded by some even in England as the greatest statesman of the age. Prince Bismarck has been called the greatest revolutionist of our time, and in so far as reaction can incite to revolution he is worthy of the title even in domestic affairs.² His marvellous success in consolidating Germany has blinded men's eyes to his incapacity for any real statesmanship in the wider sense. In place of helping the mass of the population to a better position, instead of teaching the upper classes and the royal family that the only hope of safety for his country in these days is to make common cause with the people, and lighten the burdens which grind them down, he has thought only of violence and aggrandisement, of territorial extension and military power. What is the result? Of

² The treatment of the Social Democrats in Hamburg is a fair example of this. These people had violated no law whatever. However obnoxious their opinions, they were a peaceful, quiet, orderly folk. Prince Bismarck has made martyrs of them, and sent them adrift to preach their doctrines and parade their wrongs. No greater outrage upon liberal principles has been committed in our time.

all the nations of civilised Europe, Germany is that in which revolution seems nearest at hand, and will when it comes be most dangerous. The great minister of brute force seats himself by the shore of modern politics, and orders back in earnest the current of his time. The waves of the democracy he has dared to trifle with sweep away even now the sandy basis of his power!

Turning to France, can anything be more remarkable than the contrast between the position now and nine years ago? Then the horrors of the downfall of the Commune, the burnings, the destruction of public monuments, the murder of the generals, induced many humane people to overlook the hideous cruelty with which it was suppressed. Those days when the populace held sway—and Paris was not so badly governed during that remarkable time—opened the eyes of the comfortable classes all over the world to the possibility of similar occurrences nearer to themselves. It seemed like a social nightmare, and was attributed to a strange access of excitement due to the prolonged strain of the siege. And now we see the Commune day after day glorified in journals of the highest influence. The amnesty of the Communists was carried as preparatory to one of the greatest national fêtes that France has ever seen. The returned political exiles and prisoners are regarded as the victims of the bourgeoisie, and the frightful scenes on the plain of Satory, the dreadful incidents of the voyage to New Caledonia, are remembered as the martyrdoms of the founders of the new social faith. Certainly, none could have anticipated that Communist principles would so soon make head again, not only in the capital but in the provinces. Yet we see they do. The denounced suspects of 1871 are the coming party of 1881, just as the ‘*fou furieux*’ of Thiers is for the moment master of France. The great meeting of the Socialists in Paris, when what we should consider the most subversive doctrines were openly promulgated, was significant enough. Their differences simply arose as to whether it would be advisable to attempt to carry out their programme by main force or allow legislative changes to work it out peacefully. As to the main objects to be aimed at there was practical unanimity, and the removal of private property as the basis of modern social life was the conclusion arrived at by all. Yet the Communism of France, though perhaps more outspoken, is not as a whole so dangerous to the existing principles which govern society as the Socialism of Germany. There are those of the extreme party, no doubt, who superadd to the theories of Lassalle and Marx the completest acceptance of doctrines which utterly destroy the most rudimentary ideas of family life, and regard the connection between the sexes as a matter to be ordered solely in accordance with the views of the persons immediately concerned. In purely political matters the *Rappel*, the *Citoyen*, the *Mot d'Ordre*, the *Intransigeant*, and even the *Justice*, go great lengths, whilst the revolutionary sheets of

Marseilles and Lyons are even more pronounced. But the very openness of all these discussions tends to a less dangerous state of affairs, and so far the principal agitations have been directed towards obtaining those cardinal liberties which we ourselves have secured long ago. Still, the movement has been very rapid there too, and the cruel expulsion of the monks and nuns shows that true toleration is not fully understood by those who claim infinite latitude for themselves. The increasing confidence of the *nouvelles couches sociales* in their future is very apparent. The election of M. Beaurepaire at Besançon had much the same relation to French politics that the election of Hartmann at Hamburg had to German. It showed that men of more decided views were gaining ground on M. Gambetta, whose candidate was defeated, and that the French people were getting tired of an opportunism which had ceased to be opportune. Recent events have but enforced the hint then given. M. Clémenceau's successful visit to Marseilles, and the defeat of M. Ferry's Cabinet, are only straws which show the flow of French opinion; it is clear that the Conservative Republic in any very Conservative sense is at an end. Frenchmen are weary of the perpetual officialism which weighs upon them under the Republic as under the Empire; they long to feel that the Republic, which divides them the least, will no longer be afraid to trust them as Republicans. The advanced party, however, are ever on the watch, and when strikes occur the familiar Socialist catch-words are heard, showing that the ideas which brought about the national workshops of 1848 are ever in men's minds. In France, too, the militarisation and education of the masses is going steadily on at the expense of the well-to-do classes. Men who consider Gambetta reactionary and Clémenceau a too reluctant Liberal are far advanced enough to try the effect of new theories to their fullest extent.

But the peasantry are distinctly Conservative, though increasingly Republican. That is true, and they may yet act as a drag upon the cities, though even so there is much more discontent in rural France than is commonly supposed, owing to the action of the mortgage companies and other credit organisations. A saviour of the society of small proprietors might still be welcomed, or a semi-Communistic Empire might come in to bridge over the transition period, if transition period it be. Seven millions of proprietors are not, however, likely to join in any loud cry for the division of goods with the prospect of having to divide again a few years later. Their thrift and industry have enabled them to make their life tolerably comfortable, and few people less understand the schemes of the agitators of the cities. It has been one of Gambetta's titles to confidence that he convinced the peasantry that nothing of the kind was to be feared from the new Republic.

Meanwhile the State is taking the public works of the country

more completely into control; the municipalities are more and more adopting the management of their own affairs, and thus the principle of joint control for the common good is being steadily introduced. Were it not for the religious difficulty, which has assumed so dangerous a shape, it is still possible that France, which has previously been the originator of great revolutionary troubles, might on the present occasion suffer less than other nations. But the questions at issue are those which most stir men's minds. Doubts as to the right of individual ownership, plans for the confiscation of all capital in order that an enormous experiment may be tried on the only scale which it is said will be successful, can scarcely be accepted without that sort of difference which ultimately leads to bloodshed. The heads of the French Republic are men of vigour and sagacity. But the power may pass from them to the hotter-headed orators who are now appealing to the passions of the poorer classes, successful though M. Gambetta seems likely to be at the present time.

As in Germany and France, so, though not to so noticeable an extent as yet, is it in Austria and Italy. In the former country decentralisation and home rule are carrying on a political struggle against the centralising plans which are thought necessary to keep the empire together, whilst below the social strain is beginning to be felt. The agrarian difficulties which were aggravated by the crisis of 1873 have not yet been overcome. Hungary itself is in a doubtful condition; throughout the empire, the evictions and the attempts to check emigration have produced a bad effect. Still, there is far more liberty than in Germany, and therefore, in spite of the pressure of the conscription and the bitterness felt in some instances against the aristocratic class, the danger to existing institutions is not nearly so great. Socialism is not yet an organised force. In Italy, notwithstanding the factious conduct of sections of the Republican party, of the Barsanti clubs, the Irredentist agitation, and the mad language of some prominent men, the same may be said. The troubles at present are likely to be more political than social, though one would affect the other, and a stir in any other part of Europe would be felt there also. For we see that even in Norway and Sweden, where the bulk of the population is well-to-do, and in Denmark as well, no sooner does pressure come than Socialist agitators appear, and the regular Communist cries are heard. Of Russia it is needless to speak. There the revolution, if it comes, will probably take an agrarian shape, an outburst of Middle-Age barbarism, which has little in common with the agitations of Western Europe. The Nihilism of Russia may possibly be the spark to fire the whole European magazine of combustibles, but the ignorance of the greater part of the population renders any comparison between the two states of society futile. The Socialist proclamations of the Revolutionary Committee are altogether premature. A despotism has to be destroyed, a people educated, and some idea of political life

permitted to grow up before Russian Socialism can be really a practical subject for discussion in the German or French sense. The conspiracy is interesting on account of its determination and secrecy; the whole condition of Russia also is well worthy of study, but it is quite possible that the political, financial, and social anarchy there may after all work itself out for the time by disruption of the empire or foreign war. The idea of the corrupt and barbarous Slavonic power as a civilising agency is of course a grotesque paradox.³

What, however, renders the situation in regard to all countries more hazardous than would otherwise be the case, is that remarkable facility of communication which has been the growth of the present generation. Railroads, telegraphs, cheap newspapers, may all be said to date for the Continent since 1848. As we see, excitement is now in the air. It is felt and communicates itself to vast masses of men without any apparent reason. A wave of political, social, financial disturbance passes from one great centre to another now as it never did before. And those who are concerned in Socialist manœuvres are specially ready to take advantage of this. The two great centres of agitation are Geneva and London. There the exiled speedily come together. The Socialist from Germany, the Communist from France, the Nihilist from Russia, each betakes himself at first to his solitary garret; but all soon get known to one another, suggest ideas for common action, and keep one another informed as to the progress made in each country towards the common goal. Thus has been re-formed an International Organisation more formidable than that which fell into discredit by its participation in the Paris Commune. In this way the advance can be observed all along the line. If baffled in Germany, it is making head in France; if in France men's minds turn from the new ideas, Austria or Italy affords encouragement. And thus poor men bound together by an enthusiasm for what is little more than an abstraction, resolve to carry out that programme which to most of us Englishmen seems a very midsummer madness, of elevating the whole race of civilised men by a complete change of the conditions in which man has yet been civilised. They resolve, I say, and when they see an opportunity they mean to execute. The condition of Europe may favour their plans.

But now comes what is perhaps the most remarkable feature in the whole of this Continental movement. Much has been said from time to time of the power of Jews in modern society. Lord Beaconsfield, always proud of his race, has pointed out their superiority in many directions, and all would admit that in money-getting and in music they are in some sort inspired. But the influence of Jews at

³ The increasing famine in Russia must play into the hands of the revolutionary party. Hunger is ever the best insurrectionist, and unless the Government acts more wisely than at present the peasantry will become disaffected.

the present time is more noticeable than ever. That they are at the head of European capitalists, we are all well aware. The fact that during a long period they were absolutely driven into money-dealing as their sole business, seems to have developed an hereditary faculty of accumulation which, money being the power it now is, gives influence in every direction. In politics many Jews are in the front rank. The press in more than one European capital is almost wholly in their hands. The Rothschilds are but the leading name among a whole series of capitalists, which includes the great monetary chiefs of Berlin and Amsterdam, Paris and Frankfort. They have forced their way into the nobility of every country, and in all the vast financial schemes of recent years the hand of the Jews has been felt both for good and evil. That their excessive wealth, used as it has been, acts as a solvent influence in modern society, cannot be questioned. The barriers of religion and caste prejudice melt away before it. But whilst on the one hand the Jews are thus beyond dispute the leaders of the plutocracy of Europe, holding in large as well as in small matters, in the great centres as well as in the villages of Russia and Roumania, the power of the purse, another section of the same race form the leaders of that revolutionary propaganda which is making way against that very capitalist class represented by their own fellow-Jews. Jews—more than any other men—have held forth against those who make their living not by producing value, but by trading on the differences of value; they at this moment are acting as the leaders in the revolutionary movement which I have endeavoured to trace. Surely we have here a very strange phenomenon. Whilst the hatred against one section of Jews is growing in Germany, Russia, Roumania, and indeed all through Eastern Europe, to such an extent that they are persistently persecuted, and the question even in educated Germany threatens to become a political danger, the more the others, remaining poor and trusting only to their brains for influence, are gaining ground on the side of the people. In America we may note a similar state of things; the dislike of the rich Jews is increasing among all the well-to-do classes, whilst the revolutionary Jew from Germany and France has been at work among the artisan class in the great cities. Those, therefore, who are accustomed to look upon all Jews as essentially practical and conservative, as certain, too, to enlist on the side of the prevailing social system, will be obliged to reconsider their conclusions. But the whole subject of the bad and good effects of Jewish influence on European social conditions is worthy of a more thorough investigation than can be undertaken here. Enough, that in the period we are approaching not the slightest influence on the side of revolution will be that of the Jew.

The position of Great Britain and her colonies, as well as the United States, differs from that of European countries inasmuch as

the Anglo-Saxon communities have long had nearly all that the people of the Continent of Europe are still striving for. Rights of public meeting, freedom of the press, and freedom of speech, the fullest possible personal liberty—these have long been secured, and men of our race have so far been able to work out political problems without that dangerous excitement which has attended the endeavour to solve them elsewhere. It is the general belief that this steady progress will continue in England, and that although the social arrangements of English life may be greatly modified in time to come, yet that here, at least, we shall be able to satisfy the legitimate claims of the many without trenching upon the rights or the privileges of the few. But Communism in the sense of State and Municipal management is making head continuously, even in the sense of genuine Communism—that the well-to-do should provide for the poor certain advantages whether they like to do so or not. That competition is being given up as a principle in favour of organisation for the common benefit, is at any rate quite clear. The postal and telegraph arrangements are entirely under State management already, and sooner or later railways will fall under the same control. In municipalities the provision of gas and water, like the arrangements for street paving, sewers, or the removal of nuisances, is conducted more and more by the directly appointed agents of the towns themselves. For the principle of limited monopoly and regulated competition, we are steadily substituting State and municipal organisation and control. That the poor law is distinctly communistic has long been urged, and indeed it is difficult to see how any system could be more completely so in intention than that which puts it in the power of an able-bodied man to live upon the earnings or savings of others, because he has been unlucky or lazy himself. The argument that no man must be allowed to starve itself leads directly to Communism if strictly applied. But of course the free-school system, where it exists, is a still further step in this direction. Not only do ratepayers provide a good education for those who could not afford it themselves, but they give their poorer neighbours the advantage that their children, educated at the expense of the well-to-do, shall enter into competition in the battle of life with the children of those who have found the means to pay for their schooling. The Artisans Dwellings Act was a smaller step in the same direction; and the proposal not long since made that children should be fed in the Board schools at the expense of the ratepayers was Communism pure and simple. Thus whilst we are arguing about Communism, and in some directions upholding the old idea that competition, not State management, must be the rule, we ourselves are slowly advancing, without perhaps observing it, towards the system which when proposed in all its bluntness we denounce as a chimera under the present circumstances of mankind. Poor-law relief and the School-Board education are communistic in principle.

The Post-Office telegraphs and municipal management of gas and water involve the principle of the State or Commune's control. Does not this, even in sober England, show the tendency of the time?

In our colonies we see this carried still further. In Victoria there is the most complete State control. Post, telegraphs, railways, public works, education, Crown lands, each and all are managed by bureaux, and there is no tendency whatever towards getting rid of this responsibility. In New Zealand the method is carried still further. There also the whole of these departments are carried on under State management, and besides the community is taxed in order to provide free or assisted passages for emigrants from England who cannot pay for themselves. Then comes a time of pressure such as has lately been seen, and the State has to provide what is to all intents and purposes national employment for the people thrown out of work. What is this again but the gradual establishment of a communistic method? Granted that assisted emigration has proved—as it has—successful when coupled with State works at which the emigrants are employed, we still have here the arrangement for which, in another field, the apostles of the new Socialism contend. The same reasoning applies to the municipal borrowing arrangements which are used in the general interest.

All this, however, merely shows that much is going on of a communistic tendency without being observed: the graver features in our home life, those which might under conceivable conditions lead to a struggle between classes on the rights connected with property, are far more worthy of consideration at the present time. My friends, Mr. Kebbel and Mr. Traill, have ably pointed out, in recent numbers of this Review, the serious political dangers which arise from the wide gulf between the upper and the lower classes, how the vote of the ignorant many is now the ultimate court of appeal, and how essential it is from their Conservative point of view that the aristocratic and the wealthy, the intellectual and the refined, should try to recover their waning influence by a closer connection with, and knowledge of, the people. Hitherto there has been nothing more noticeable in English society than the noble bearing of the people even under the greatest pressure. The Lancashire Cotton Famine, the late period of prolonged stagnation of trade, passed over with little or no disturbance. No other country in the world could in all probability have supported such a strain as the former without grave internal trouble. Men recognised the inevitable, and made up their minds to bear with it, at the same time that the well-to-do endeavoured to alleviate the distress. Nor is there in England that envy of wealth which is to be found elsewhere. If grand equipages or well-mounted horsemen were to pass through many parts of Paris or Berlin, they would scarcely escape without insult or probably injury. In London or most of our other great cities, there is not this feeling of hatred

against the display of riches. The leaders of Continental Socialism themselves admit that they have made little way in England. Our long political history has not passed for nothing. The working classes, it is true, feel their own power more and more; but so long as they think they can see their way to what they want through constitutional means, they have no mind to try the subversory doctrines of the Continental agitators.

A continuance of this attitude nevertheless depends entirely upon the amount of consideration which they receive. Let any one look at the state of society in some of the great northern towns, and, leaving the misery of London aside, he will see that here are all the elements of the fiercest and, under certain conditions, of the most uncontrollable democracy the world has ever seen. For it may almost be said that there is no middle class to break the force of the collision between the capitalist and those whom he employs. This vast population of workers has grown up within the last fifty years. There is the employer, who for the most part lives out of the city, there are the mean dwellings inhabited by the hands, and the great factories in which they spend their lives. But all depends upon one or two trades: there is but little actually saved by the mass of workers, and, as certain indications have shown, the spirit of turbulence might again be awakened. When we reflect for a moment upon the disproportion of numbers, can we fail to be struck with the danger that might come upon all if some eloquent, fervent enthusiast, stirred by the injustices and inequalities around him, were to appeal to the multitude to redress their social wrongs by violence? When we hear or read of the organisation of the rich, how is it that it so seldom occurs to us that the real capacity for organisation may lie below, that the hand-to-mouth labourer has little to lose, and may even think he has much to gain by a change in the conditions of his daily existence. The hope for the future lies in the fact that the rich are slowly beginning to perceive here both their dangers and their duties, and to understand that the privilege of possession now accorded to them by the consent of the majority, can only be retained by entering more fully into the daily life of the people, and remedying those mischiefs which are to be noted on every side. Those who best know the dangerous quarters of our great cities know well that there is a vast unruly mass of blackguardism which would take advantage of any break above to sweep away all barriers. Many theories are even now systematically discussed by the educated artisans which would savour of Communism to the upper class. But fortunately they are discussed, and therein is to a great extent safety. The large blocks of city property concentrated in the hands of individuals; the entire exclusion of the poor man from the possession of land; the manner in which in municipal arrangements the poorer quarters are sacrificed to the rich;

the indifference too often shown to the interests of the wage-earning class, when whole neighbourhoods are swept out of their place to benefit the community without proper provision for the housing of the inhabitants elsewhere; the impossibility of obtaining real consideration for the needs of the masses in the matter of recreation, fresh air, and pure water, especially where vested interests are involved; the general inclination to consider the ratepayer first and the benefit of the population afterwards; these and other like points are now being talked over by men who have experienced the evils of the present system, and are making ready by fair means to put an end to them. Granting that the English people are not democratic in the Continental sense, admitting that they do respect their 'natural leaders,' and are ready to follow them politically and socially in orderly fashion, this presupposes that the upper classes are ready to lead, not for the selfish advantage of their own insignificant section, but for the benefit of that class which, as has been well said, is really the nation. The opportunity, and it is a glorious one, is now. We have shown the world how to combine social progress with the widest and soundest political freedom; we, as a nation, have laid the foundation of that great trinity of liberty—freedom of speech, freedom of trade, and freedom of religion—which will remain the title of England to honour and to reverence when all other smaller deeds are forgotten in the mists of antiquity. It remains for us too to lead the way with safety in that great social reorganisation which is the work of the immediate future to secure for all the same happiness and enjoyment of life which now belong to few.

When poverty and injustice rankle, there we, too, find the most subversionary ideas have free play under our rule. What can be more discreditable than the condition of Ireland? A long period of economical and political misdoing has produced its almost inevitable result—a result which we view, as a nation, with mingled feelings of anger and disgust. What we deplore is an agrarian strike aggravated by rattening and intimidation in their most atrocious form. A large proportion of the tenantry have some of their own free will, and many, in consequence of pressure, entered into a combination against the payment of what they consider excessive rents. This is nothing less than a social revolution, and the horrible murders and outrages on cattle by which it is accompanied ought not to distract attention for a moment from the original disease which has led to this climax. But no sooner does a real difficulty arise in applying the ordinary law of the country with vigour and effect than straightway a cry is raised for a suspension of the first guarantee of all liberty, and Parliamentary lynch law is proclaimed on the housetops as the highest statesmanship. Suspend the Habeas Corpus Act and run them all in—such is the political teaching of our very moderate men. That the landlords, whose 'rights of property' are thus set at nought, should

call out to the majority of their fellow-subjects to secure for them, no matter how, that to which by the law as it stands they are entitled, is natural enough; but only the fact that for months past men have been engaged in examining the fundamental conditions of all civilised society, and are somewhat embarrassed by their investigations, can account for this desperate haste to recur to old despotic methods. The least that can be said on the other side is that, in order to calm dangerous dissatisfaction with existing laws, we must override some of the cherished theories of ordinary political economy. Thus, in the face of dangerous agitation, we, like others, find that the only sound means of maintaining order is by a combination of legal but almost revolutionary change with more or less pronounced despotism. The dangerous communism of the Fenians, who represent the extreme left wing of the Irish party, is as completely destructive of present arrangements as the purest socialism of Paris or Berlin. It is useless to shut our eyes to the facts, unpleasant as they may be. In stirring times the only safe policy is to recognise that what may have been wisdom yesterday becomes the height of folly to-day. If only the plain speaking about Ireland, which is now to be heard all round, had been in fashion a few years ago, we should not have to make up our minds to something not far short of a measure for compensated expropriation of landlords.

In England the land question has hitherto scarcely been entered upon. Economical causes are working a silent revolution, which will be far more complete than perhaps any of us have as yet fully understood. The longer an attempt at settlement is delayed, however, the greater way will be made among the agricultural labourers by those who are anxious to bring about a change at least as great as that which settled the French villeins in the possession of their holdings. Ideas move fast, and though tenant farmers may not reason to their own case from what is going on in Ireland, will anybody guarantee that this is so with all who are concerned with the land?

Fortunately we need but ordinary care and sagacity to pass through a period which might prove dangerous with benefit to ourselves. The English tendency is to build up from the bottom, to improve the conditions of life below. There has been much neglect, but it may be remedied. Meantime, we are at least not creating enemies to society by deliberate enactment, and then arming them so that they may be able to overthrow the whole structure. Our emigration is in the main beneficial to us. It affords a safe and honourable outlet for those adventurous spirits who might otherwise turn their energies into a dangerous channel. They go forth to America and our colonies, and those who succeed form on their return a progressive and yet in the best sense a conservative body at home. With us, therefore, the revolution involved in the change of the

political centre of gravity may be peacefully worked out.⁴ What has occurred and what may occur again in America is, however, worth brief consideration. There, with endless land to fall back upon close at hand—which we, however much our land system may be modified, could never boast—the same agitation which threatens the Continent has burst out into actual violence. The riots in Pittsburg and Baltimore are almost forgotten in this country, but the action then taken by the masses of the large towns was most significant. Thoughtful Americans are well aware that the outbreak was in the last degree dangerous, and that it might be renewed at a favourable moment. But for the resolute action of one or two private capitalists, the matter would have gone much further than it did. In any case hatred of the capitalist class is growing up among a certain section of the community, and Socialist ideas are promulgated in St. Louis and Chicago as well as in Pittsburg, Philadelphia, and New York. Even the Western farmers, who are the closest hands at a bargain, and assuredly have no avowed communistic views in regard to property in general, are not by any means disinclined to deal with railroads and all land but their own in a decidedly communistic fashion. If amid the favourable conditions for general prosperity to be found in America, these ideas can take root and spread, this is in itself good evidence that there exists at the present time a decided tendency towards attempting a new solution of social difficulties. Experiments in practical Communism, such as those of the Mormons, the Shakers, the Memnonites, and others are merely interesting as experiments. They are trifling matters when compared with an agitation like that in California, or a rising which at one moment bid fair to put the whole railroad system of the Eastern States at the mercy of a furious mob.

Thus whichever way we look, whether to the Continent of Europe or to newly-settled countries, we see plainly that the principle of State management, which is practical enough within certain limits, is making way at the same time that notions which extend to dealing with all property for the benefit of the mass, and not for the individual, are gaining strength and coherence. The former system may be peacefully and perhaps beneficially worked out; the latter must involve anarchy and bloodshed in the beginning, and can scarcely under any conditions we can at present imagine prove successful in the end. Yet at a period such as ours anything may be tried. One of the features of the time is the prevailing incredulity among the educated of all civilised communities. Religious sanctions

⁴ The facilities recently offered for saving, and the investment of small sums in Consols, tend of course to knit the thrifty of all classes closer to the existing form of society, or at any rate to render its modification, if ever it should prove admissible, less dangerous to the public peace.

are shaken in every country, political institutions are themselves in a state of fusion—for who shall say that Parliamentary government has proved fully successful?—the growing knowledge and power of the masses leads them to consider more and more seriously the strange inequalities of our existing arrangements, the spread of ideas from one centre to another is so rapid as almost to defy calculation. Can it, then, be said that we are safe for any length of time from the shock of one of those convulsions which may change the whole social prospect? Those who condemn democracy, who look askance at the determination to give political power to every class in order that all may be able to insist upon their share in the general advancement, are but rendering more probable the overturn they dread. The old days of aristocracy and class privileges are passing away fast; we have to consider now how to deal with the growing democratic influence, so that we may benefit by the experience of others. This can only be done by a steady determination at the outset to satisfy the needs and gratify the reasonable ambition of all.

H. M. HYNDMAN.

THE HISTORICAL CLAIMS OF TENANT RIGHT.

No one who appreciates the difficulties of the task which lies before the Government in Ireland would wish to add needlessly to the flood of literature already overwhelming the subject.

But after the remarkable statements of Mr. Froude and Lord Sherbrooke it may be useful to place before the public succinctly the main facts in the economic history of the Irish peasant tenants. This is the best way, I think, to prove beyond a doubt that there is a very real and practical difference between these peasant tenants and ordinary tenant farmers of the English type. Until it is clearly understood wherein, historically and economically, this difference lies, it is impossible to understand even what laws of political economy apply to the case. For the laws of political economy are not mere empirical rules fitting at random all possible cases; they are the necessary result of the interaction of two chief factors, viz.: Physical external conditions and the constitution of human nature, and so must vary with local variations in the two factors, and the historical circumstances under which they are thrown together.

What, then, is the Economic History of Irish Peasant Tenures?

To begin with, peasant tenures are well-known in history. They exist, or have existed, in nearly every country in Europe. Historically and economically they seem to have arisen out of a primitive action of the law of division of labour before the birth of capital.

The two all-controlling economic necessities of primitive society have everywhere been defence and food—war and agriculture. Hence arose everywhere the division of society in its early tribal form into two classes—military and agricultural. And as the former were, from the nature of the case, everywhere the stronger, and the latter the weaker class, it was but natural that History, when first disclosing the actual condition of things in European nations, should almost everywhere discover the peasantry to be in practical serfdom to the other class who had assumed the overlordship of the land.

Again, as bees everywhere live in hives and make hexagonal cells, so peasants' land everywhere seems to have been at first held in common, under rules supported by custom, and securing the easy division of its occupancy from time to time among them. The

method almost universally followed to facilitate this frequent division (especially of arable land) has been to divide the common fields of a community into a vast number of small pieces—larger or smaller ‘acres’—a number of which could be allotted to each household, scattered all over the fields to insure equality in the allotment. So, speaking roughly as regards the arable land, open fields, divided up into ‘acres,’ became everywhere the mark of peasant tenures; and the scattering of the pieces of which it was composed became the mark of a peasant holding.

Further, certain general economic facts have everywhere ruled the historical development of the peasant holdings, and produced the peculiar legal rights arising out of them. For law, it must not be forgotten, is the creature of facts. Its business is to recognise facts. It sometimes tries to control them, and rightly where it can. But unless the facts follow or coincide with the law, the attempt to control them is idle and futile. As Abraham Lincoln once said, Law which does not carry facts with it is ‘like a pope’s bull against a comet.’

In the absence of capital necessity excluded contract. The peasant population were upon the land, must live upon the land, and could not be removed from the land. It had been from time immemorial under an overlordship claiming from it tribute and services. Long custom had fixed the services and sanctioned the permanence of the tenure. The law had followed the fact and sanctioned the custom. With permanence of occupation grew up habits of practical ownership; and when, for many generations, everything on the peasant holdings had been done by the tenant, the element of ownership became more and more completely recognised. At last, when the necessity came for the law to deal with the result, and to arrange a severance between the shares in the joint ownership of the landlord and the peasant tenant, invariably the law followed the fact and gave the tenant the right to buy out the landlord’s interest, and so enfranchise his holding. In England the same evolution was passed through as in other countries, only it took place centuries earlier than in other countries. In England the copyholder was the last survivor of the peasant tenant, and enclosure and enfranchisement generally went together, throwing the scattered pieces of which his holding consisted into one lump, so that he came out of the process a freeholder of a block of land smaller than his original holding, but, at the same time, freed from manorial rights. By the same process the landlord’s estate was limited to his demesne land, while his demesne itself was enlarged.

There is no mystery in the various stages of this process, and it will be seen that *contract* did not enter deeply into any one of them. Economic facts, and the necessities arising out of them, ruled the course of the history, and the law gradually following the facts threw its weight into the scale, which long custom had weighted in favour of the ultimate enfranchisement of the peasant tenant.

Such has been the economic history of peasant tenures in Russia, Germany, France, and England. Contrast with this the parallel history of the 'tenant farmer' of the English type, and then the distinction between the two classes will be clearly manifest.

The 'tenant farmer' is the creature of contract. He has grown up not on the open field of the peasant land, but upon the demesne land occupied by the lord himself, which was not subject to peasant tenures. This lord's demesne did not go with the peasant land into villenage or serfdom, and so never needed enfranchisement. The tenants upon it were free tenants (*libere tenentes*), and not peasant or villein tenants. And the economic history of the 'tenant farmer' is simply this. The owner ceasing to care about tilling his own land, let or farmed it out under a contract to a tenant who had capital, and made agriculture a trade. It was a new and temporary commercial tenure created afresh every time there was a change of tenancy, and the legal rights of the tenancy were settled and fixed afresh each time within the four corners of the contract. The economic facts which produced the prevalence of tenant-farming in England were the depopulation of the Black Death, the breaking up of serfdom, the growth of capital, the substitution of wages for services and the consequent economic division which grew up between the ownership of land, capital, and labour. These facts produced the 'tenant farmer,' and the reason why in England the area under 'tenant farming' and the individual holdings are so large, is that economic laws have favoured first the accumulation of capital and land in few hands, and then farming on a large scale.

Now there are tenant farmers in Ireland of this modern English type, wherever peasant tenures have been cleared away and the land has been let on the English system under a commercial contract to a man with capital. No one doubts this. But turning to the Irish peasant tenants, the question arises why the course of economic evolution in their case has not followed the same lines as those which have ruled the economic history of all the other peasantries of Europe, converting them into peasant proprietors.

There must have been good reasons for this, and they ought to be clearly understood by all who wish to comprehend the meaning of the present crisis.

The main peculiarity in the economic history of Ireland and Irish tenures arose from the fact that until the sixteenth century English law and English tenures were in force only within the pale. Outside of it, in Ireland proper, Irish tenures remained untouched. And the curious result was that these Irish tenures, with those of the Scotch Highlands at the same period, were remarkable as the latest European survival into modern times of the ancient system of the tribal ownership of land by chieftains and septs. The same system once prevailed in Wales, and it had probably once prevailed all over

Britain before the Saxon conquest effaced it. But it had continued in Ireland for 1,000 years longer than it did in England. Let us try to realise what this form of land ownership or occupation was in the days of James I.

In the first place what was a *sept*? A curious example of an actual sept occurs in the State Papers of James I.,¹ and it shows that a sept was a community of blood relations using one surname and holding together under one chief.

In 1606, the whole sept of the 'Greames' (Grahams) under their chief, 'Walter, the gude man of Netherby,' being troublesome on the Scottish border, were transplanted from Cumberland to Roscommon; and in the schedule to the articles effecting this transfer, it appears that the sept consisted of 124 persons, nearly all bearing the surname of *Grame*. They were divided into families, seventeen of which were set down as possessed of 20*l.* and upwards, four of 10*l.* and upwards, six of the poorer sort, six of no abilities, while as dependents there were four servants of the name of *Grame*, and about a dozen of irregular hangers on to the sept.

The sept was a human swarm. The chief was the Queen Bee round whom they clustered. The territory occupied by a whole sept was divided among the inferior septs which had swarmed off it. And a sort of feudal relation prevailed between the parent and the inferior septs.

Their main wealth consisted in cattle, and the allotment by the chief of each sept of his surplus cattle among the members of his sept, or strangers introduced into it, cemented their relation to him. So also did the system under which the chief put out his children to foster among his followers. But personal as was in this way the relation between the chief and sept, there was also an intimate connection between the sept system and its land divisions. The sept fitted into its territory like a snail into its shell.

Throwing aside Irish terms, it may be said roughly that the homesteads were in clusters of four or six, and that each of these clusters was the fourth of a larger cluster or townland—the whole territory of a sept consisting of so many townlands. The townland was probably the unit of common occupation, and the arable land within it was divided by the chief among the families or homesteads periodically, according to ancient traditional rules. This process was aided by the division of the open common fields, as already described, into ridges or acres, which admitted of easy distribution among the family holdings, according to the arrangement still known as 'run-rig,' 'rundale,' or 'runacre.' This method had been followed for probably 1000 years. Documents supposed to have been composed in the tenth century² represent Ireland as in the sixth or seventh century divided into 184 septs, occupying 5,520 townlands divided into quarters, each of which contained six households or homesteads, making the

¹ 1603-6, p. 554.

² See the third volume of Skene's *History of Celtic Scotland*, p. 155.

total of the latter 132,480, and suggesting a population of about three-quarters of a million. In 1598,³ the number of townlands was stated at 6,814, which would make the number of homesteads 109,000 at four homesteads to the quarter, and 163,000 if there were six. According to a survey of the county of Monaghan taken in 1591,⁴ the townlands in that county were found to be divided into quarters, each of which was a cluster of four tates or homesteads. The names of the occupiers are also given, and they are evidently blood relations sharing the same surname, like those in the sept of the Greames from Cumberland. This curious actual division of the townlands and arrangement of the homesteads in clusters of four, together with the division of the fields into ridges, was what facilitated the frequent redivisions of the lands of the sept and of the common fields amongst the members of the sept according to their families and the degree of their relationship to the parent stock.

At the same time the intimate relation between sept and chief was kept up by their sharing the same wild life, and living in the same simple kind of cabin, as well as by the blood relationship between them. The relation between them was not that of landlord and tenant, but the chief claimed his gifts of food according to his needs, and lived upon his followers according to his will and pleasure. The chief had further his own lion's share in the tribal land on which his cattle were herded, and the homesteads of his own immediate servants located.

This was the system of land occupation under which Ireland was occupied by the Irish septs down to the time of James I.—a system to which separate ownership and the relation of landlord and tenant were equally foreign. It was a system as widespread as their race, and deeply engrained in their national character by the traditions of 1000 years. To tell the Irish, therefore, to suddenly change this system, to adopt English social arrangements, and to adapt themselves to English law, was to tell them to do something against their nature and beyond their power. To speak plainly and to put the case strongly—too strongly, indeed, in degree, but not too strongly to make plain the principle involved—it was like telling bees no longer to swarm, but in future to gather honey each on its own hook, building its separate cells apart by itself instead of in the hive. In spite of English mandates and English laws, the Irish still show the inherent propensity to swarm and to build their cells in the ancient hive. They still cling with hereditary tenacity to the land of their sept, and insist upon settling—one might almost say sprawling—their families upon it, in spite of law and landlords.

But to return to the times of James I. To his law officers belonged the difficult task of converting these Irish tenures into their

³ Hogan's *Description of Ireland in 1598*.

⁴ *Inquisitiones Cancellarie Hibernie*, ii. xxi.

⁵ See Sir John Davis's *Historical Tracts*, London, 1786; Mr. Skene's *Celtic Scotland*, vol. iii., and the prefaces to *Ancient Laws of Ireland*. Compare the system described in the *Ancient Laws of Wales*.

supposed English equivalents. The interest of the problem and of their method of solving it lies in the question: How they concluded to treat the inferior members of the sept, whether as tenants at will of the chief as if they were English tenant farmers, or as entitled to permanent fixity of tenure such as that possessed by English copyholders and the serfs of Continental manors.

Sir John Davis was the Attorney-General of James I. He it was upon whom the difficult task devolved; and therefore no better evidence than his statements could possibly be quoted.

He soon found out the double difficulty which lay in his way. (1) The chief was not, properly speaking, a landlord, and (2) the inferior members of the sept were not, properly speaking, his tenants. How then could the English law of absolute ownership or of landlord and tenant be made to apply?

He explains this double difficulty thus:

1. By the Irish custom of tanistry the chieftains of every country and the chief of every sept had no longer estate than for life in their chiefteries, the inheritance whereof did rest in no man. And these chiefteries, though they had some portions of land allotted unto them, did consist chiefly in cuttings and coscheries and other Irish exactions, whereby they did spoil and impoverish the people, at their pleasure. And when their chieftains were dead their sons or next heirs did not succeed them, but their *tanists*, who were elective, and purchased their elections by strong hand.

2. And by the Irish custom of gavelkind the inferior tenancies were partable amongst all the males of the sept; and after partition made, if any one of the sept had died his portion was not divided among his sons, but the chief of the sept made a new partition of all the lands belonging to that sept, and gave every one his part according to his antiquity.

These two Irish customs (Sir John Davis continues) made all their possessions uncertain, being shuffled and changed and removed so often from one to another by new elections and partitions, which uncertainty of estates hath been the true cause of such desolation and barbarism in this land.⁶

The attempt to substitute English tenures instead of these Irish tenures had never yet been made *throughout Ireland*. The attempt had only been made in former reigns in isolated cases, and the system on which the change had been attempted in these cases seemed to the Attorney-General of James I. a mistaken one.

For although that in the twelfth year of Queen Elizabeth a special law was made which did enable the Lord Deputy to take surrenders and regrant estates unto the Irishry, yet were there but few Irish lords that made offer to surrender during her reign; and they which made surrender of entire countries obtained grants of the whole again to themselves only, and to no other, and *all in demesne*. In passing of which grant there was no care taken of the inferior septs of people inhabiting and possessing these countries under them, but they held their several portions in course of tanistry and gavelkind, and yielded the same Irish duties or exactions as they did before. So that upon every such surrender and grant there was but one freeholder made in a whole country, which was the lord himself. All the rest were but tenants at will or rather tenants in villenage, and were neither fit to be sworn on juries nor to perform any public service. And by reason of the uncertainty of their estates they did utterly neglect to build or to plant or to improve

⁶ Sir John Davis's *Discovery of Ireland*, 1612, p. 167.

the land. And therefore, although the lord were become the king's tenant, his country was no whit reformed thereby, but remained in the former barbarism and desolation.

But now (he continues) since his Majesty came to the Crown, two special commissions have been sent out of England for the settling and quieting of all the possessions in Ireland, the one for accepting surrenders of the Irish and degenerate English, and for regranting estates unto them, according to the course of common law: the other for strengthening of defective titles. In the execution of which commissions there hath ever been had a special care to settle and secure the *under-tenants*: to the end there might be a repose and establishment of every subject's estate: lord and tenant, freeholder and farmer, throughout the Kingdom.

Then he describes in these clear words the course taken under James I.:

Upon surrenders this course hath been held from the beginning. When an Irish lord doth offer to surrender his country, his surrender is not immediately accepted, but a commission is first awarded to inquire of three special points:—First, of the quantity and limits of the land whereof he is the reputed owner. Next, how much himself doth hold in demesne, and how much is possessed by his tenants and followers. And thirdly, what Customs' duties and services he doth yearly receive out of those lands. This inquisition being made and returned, the lands which are found to be the lord's proper possessions in demesne are drawn into a particular; and his Irish duties, as coscherings, sessings, rents of butter and oatmeal, and the like, are reasonably valued and reduced into certain sums of money, to be paid yearly in lieu thereof. This being done the surrender is accepted, and thereupon a grant is passed not of the whole country, as was used in former times, *but of those lands only* which are found in the lord's possession, and of those certain sums of money, as rents issuing out of the rest. But the lands which are found to be possessed by the tenants are left unto them respectively charged with these certain rents only, in lieu of all uncertain Irish exactions.

In like manner, upon all grants which have passed by virtue of the commission for defective titles, the Commissioners have taken special caution for preservation of the estates of all particular tenants.⁷

No words could be clearer than these. But it will be observed that Sir John Davis had in the earlier quotation spoken of chiefs of countries and chiefs of septs; *i.e.* there were septs under septs, and so chiefs under chiefs; and thus the question might possibly arise whether this careful plan of distinguishing between demesne and tenants' land was applied further than as between the superior chief of the 'country' and the sub-chief of the sept,—whether, in fact, the inferior chief of the sept inhabiting such and such townlands had his demesne land separated in the same way as the superior chief from the tenants' land under fixed rent?

Now an actual example will make this clear. The members of the inferior sept were, it will be seen, made into actual freeholders, subject only to a quit-rent.

In a letter to the Earl of Salisbury, written in 1606,⁸ Sir John Davis describes what was done in the settlement of County Monaghan. And in this letter he gives the names of the townlands granted to McMahon, the chief, to be held in demesne, with rents from so many

⁷ Sir John Davis's *Discovery of the State of Ireland*, 1612, p. 273.

⁸ His *Historical Tracts*, ed. 1786.

other townlands granted to other chiefs of inferior septs, who also have so many townlands or parts of townlands granted to them in demesne, while the sub-tenants, members of the septs, had one or more tates or homesteads allotted to them in freehold, subject only to the quit-rents to their chief, part of which went to the king.⁹

In the Calendars of State Papers of James I.¹⁰ can be traced the gradual accumulation of evidence which induced Sir John Davis to take this view of the position of the inferior members of the septs. It was the only natural view to take when the fact was once fully grasped that under the sept system of tribal ownership the land belonged to the sept, of which the chief was only the elected head.

He had, as we have said, the choice whether he would treat them as analogous to English commercial tenant-farmers or as analogous to English copyhold tenants. He chose the latter alternative, only instead of making them copyholders, requiring future enfranchisement, he preferred to make them freeholders at once, subject only to fixed quit-rents.

And let it be understood that this careful process of converting the inferior members of the septs into freeholders had nothing to do with the plantation of Ulster or any other plantation. It was the process applied to the purely Irish estates before the opportunity for the plantation of Ulster had arisen. These are Sir John Davis's own words :

And thus we see how the greatest part of the possessions (as well of the Irish as of the English) in Leinster, Connaught, and Munster, are settled and secured since his Majesty came to the Crown; whereby the hearts of the people are so settled, not only to live in peace, but raised and encouraged to build, to plant, to give better education to their children, and to improve the commodities of their lands; whereby the yearly value thereof is already increased double of that it was within these few years, and is likely daily to rise higher till it amounts to the price of our land in England.¹¹

To go one step further. It will hardly be disputed that if this legal arrangement attempted by the law officers of James I. had really been effected fully in fact, and had peaceably continued and remained under the recognition and protection of the English law, the result would have been that the lords of Irish manors would have been found to-day the legal and absolute owners of their demesne lands only, with such additions thereto as might have been awarded to them upon the enclosure of the townlands in lieu of their manorial quit-rents over the rest; while the mass of their peasant tenants would by this time, under Enclosure and Enfranchisement Acts, have become practically the absolute owners of their holdings, like English copyholders and Continental peasant proprietors.

But the course of history did not run thus smoothly on a royal road. In the first place, though the inferior members of the septs may have been satisfied or, as Sir John Davis says, even 'comforted'

⁹ See list of persons to which the several 'tates' were given, Cal. State Papers, Jas. I., 1606-8, p. 164.

¹⁰ 1606-9, pp. 20, 23, 155, 211, 386, &c.

¹¹ *Discovery of Ireland*, p. 279.

by the notion of legal protection and the substitution of fixed freeholds for their uncertain holdings, yet naturally it was a sore blow to a chief to be restricted to his demesne lands and to lose his personal rule and his capricious and unlimited rights over a multitude of dependent followers. It was, in fact, too great a change to be effected suddenly. The habits of a thousand years were not to be set aside by a stroke of the pen or by the mere wording of the patents.

Mischief very soon began to mar the completeness of the Attorney-General's settlement of Ireland. First there was the rebellion of two great Ulster chieftains, followed by the English plantation of Ulster. And let it be clearly understood that by this plantation the work of Sir John Davis was in great measure set aside. Quite inadequate provision was made for the native Irish. The rights of the newly created freeholders were in many places roughly set aside to make room for the new English and Scotch planters. And these latter covenanted on paper to allow no Irish tenants on their estates, but to establish in their place English tenants under certain tenures and with fixed rents. But, in fact, the restrictions were futile. Before many years were over the Irish tenants were back upon their old lands, and the new landlords neglected to give the certain tenures. Then came the more general rebellion of 1641, its suppression by Cromwell, and the re-settlement of Ireland under a fresh race of Scotch and English landowners.

By the Cromwellian settlement of Ireland, in theory and in law, nearly the whole land of Ireland under Irish owners was confiscated, and the whole Irish nation, like the sept of the Greames, was ordered to be bodily transplanted to Connaught.

But this was more easily said than done. First, exceptions were made to this terrible rule, and very soon the order of transplantation was confined to those only who were 'proprietors' and known rebels. Some landowners, it is known, were transplanted into Connaught with their tenants; in some cases the tenants remained behind when the landlords were transplanted; and no doubt the wholesale confiscation did disturb the legal title of the peasant holdings: so that in a strictly legal sense we must take it as settled, by the after course of the law, that the tenancies in dry law began again *de novo*. Thenceforward, the law rightly or wrongly treated the tenants, not as Sir John Davis had treated them as freeholders subject to a quit rent, not as peasant tenants with hereditary rights, but simply as commercial tenants under contracts, or, if without contracts, then as mere tenants at will. But again facts were stronger than the law. The legal confiscation on paper of all the previously recognised rights inherent in the peasant tenures, did not annihilate them in point of fact any more than the paper decree of banishment across the Shannon transplanted the peasant tenants into Connaught.

Fortunately, evidence is accessible, of the very best possible kind, proving that the peasant tenants were still, after the Rebellion, in occu-

pation of their holdings, in spite of the decree of banishment, and still possessed of actual if not legal interests in their holdings, in spite of the general confiscation. For what evidence could possibly be better evidence as to the actual position of the tenants after the Rebellion, than that of the Government official who was sent all through Ireland to fix the boundaries and define the estates of the new owners and to assess their value? This official was Sir William Petty, and his report and survey are still extant.

Let us apply a crucial test of the tenants' position. In surveying and valuing the manors did Sir William Petty find the peasant tenants still on the land; and if so, did he in valuing the lands of the new landlords include or exclude the tenants' interests, or how did he treat them?

Now, the plain answer is first that he did find peasant tenants on the manors. And an equally plain answer can be given to the second question. Sir William Petty, in valuing the total value of the land of Irish landlords after the change was made, *excepted* from the gross value the value of the tenants' interests in their holdings, thus clearly showing that he considered that the tenants were not merely modern commercial tenant farmers, but that they were possessed still of permanent and valuable interests in the land, subject to which in fact, however it might be in law, the new landlords took possession of their manors. This is his valuation:

7,500,000 acres of good, and 1,500,000 acres of coarse, making	
9,000,000, is worth per annum	£900,000
Out of which the king's quit rents, old rents, &c.	90,000
	<hr/>
	Rests £810,000
The tythes whereof are one-fifth	162,000
	<hr/>
	Rests £648,000
The benefit of leases and the value of tenants' improvements upon	
the said land is one-third, viz.:—	£210,000 ¹²
For the landlords	£432,000 ¹²

So that he estimated the value of the tenants' interests in the land at about one-third of the whole value of the land of Ireland—*i.e.*, not at one-third of the value of the land they occupied, but of the value of the *whole manor* under which they were tenants, demesne land included. There *remained to the landlord* the other two-thirds.

And that the cabins of the peasantry were valued as belonging to their one-third share of the land is clear from his urging that the tenants (not the landlords) should be encouraged to reform their cabins and build better ones.

Sir W. Petty estimated the population after the Rebellion at 1,100,000; 300,000 Protestants or English, 800,000 Papists or Irish.

The said 1,100,000 people do live in about 200,000 families or houses, whereof there are about 10,000 which have more than one chimney in each, and about

¹² Sir William Petty's *Political Anatomy of Ireland*.

24,000 which have but one; all the other houses, being 160,000, are wretched nasty cabins without chimney, window, or doorshut, even worse than those of the savage Americans, and wholly unfit for making merchantable butter and cheese, or the manufactures of woollen, linen, or leather.

We may assume that the 160,000 'nasty cabins' were mostly those of the native Irish, according well with the number of homesteads in the estimate of 1598. And now, when it is recollected that these little peasant homesteads represented not so much arable as little pasture farms, it becomes clear at once that when Sir W. Petty says the 160,000 cabins of the native Irish were unfit for dairies and manufactures, he meant that they were unfit for the purposes for which they were used. Hence, then, we may picture these peasant tenants after the Rebellion as having, to a great extent, got back to their old holdings and as still possessed at least of some farming stock—some few head of cattle saved from the herds of their old sept, and some few sheep grazing on the common pastures; patches of oats, and of flax, and perhaps already of potatoes scattered about on the 'run-rig' system round the cluster of cabins on the townland. We see the butter and the cheese made up in the smoke and dirt of the cabins, some beef and bacon cured for winter use or sale, a few skins stretched and tanned rudely into leather. We hear the whirr of the spinning wheel and the rattle of the rough wooden loom, by which the wool and flax are spun and woven. No wonder the butter, and cheese, and cloth, and leather seemed 'scarcely merchantable' to the eyes of Sir W. Petty, but then their so appearing to him when he made his survey is the best evidence we could have that a homely industry eked out the produce of the peasant holdings. Wretched as they seemed to him, he set down the value of the peasants' interests in them at one-third of the whole value of the country.

Out of the 800,000 Irish, 600,000 'lived' (he said) 'very simply in the cabins above mentioned.' And he continues, 'As for the interest of these poorer Irish it is manifestly to be transmuted into English. . . . It is their interest to deal with the English for leases, for time, and upon clear conditions, which being performed they are absolute freemen rather than [as formerly under their Irish chieftains] to stand always liable to the humour and caprice of their landlord, and to have everything taken away from them which he pleases to fancy.'

He counted, therefore, on the new landlords respecting the tenants' interests.

But alas! when power was given to the new settlers to create manors and reserve tenures to themselves, *non obstante* the Statute of Quia Emptores, no care was taken of these peasant tenants. Holdings which a few years before had been at law freeholds subject only to quit rents, were now left at law at the mercy of the new landlords, without the controlling customs which in English manors gave fixity of tenure to copyhold tenants. And, as was natural, the constant tendency of the new landlords was to push up the quit rents to rack rents, so as to transfer to the landlord as much as possible of that

one-third which Sir W. Petty put down as the property of the tenants. It cannot be said that Parliament deliberately decreed or sanctioned this injustice to the peasant holders. The whole matter was simply left as a matter of intra-manorial arrangement with which it had nothing to do. If the same thing had happened in the Middle Ages, the peasant tenants would have been made villeins, and customs would have grown up within Irish manors as in every other country in Europe, giving fixity of tenure and tenant right. But the English notion of freedom forbade that new villeins should be created by law in the seventeenth century (though it did not object to the introduction of negro slaves into English colonies), and so it simply left the Irish holders tenants-at-will, and forgot them.

But outside the law there was a fact which was practically admitted and consistently acted upon on the part of the landlords, until it became a general rule and custom almost throughout the whole of Ireland—a fact involving the growth of a tenant-right, and logically leading to something like fixity of tenure.

Sir W. Petty, as we have seen, not only recognises the fact that the cabins and improvements were the tenants' and not the landlords', but looked to the tenants and not to the landlords to improve them, and the general custom through Ireland from that time to this has followed the same rule. The landlords expended no capital on the land. The tenants, therefore, had to make its future value.

Now, if any one doubts the truth of the assertion that under such circumstances a tenant-right must inevitably grow up, and something like a right to fixity of tenure arise, let him peruse the blue-book devoted to the explanation of the way in which a similar necessity arose, and forced itself, in spite of law, upon the legislature of Prince Edward's Island, obliging recognition of the rights of tenants arising out of improvements made by them even on the expiration of long leases. According to the letter of the contracts contained in them, the landlord, in renewing the leases, could claim a rack rent. But the law was obliged to mould itself to the facts, and recognise the equities rising out of them. It was found to be impossible to simply apply the English law of landlord and tenant to a new country where the tenant reclaimed and made the value of the land. A tenant-right was first acknowledged by the Government, and ultimately it was found needful even to buy out the landlords.¹³ Under such circumstances the rights of occupancy become stronger than the rights of ownership.

It was so in Ireland. And the landlords did their best to make it so. They abandoned their ownership to middle-men so completely that in a letter quoted by Mr. Froude, written in 1775, the writer says: 'It is well known that over most parts of the country the lands

¹³ Correspondence relative to the Land Tenure question in Prince Edward Island, August 1875.

are sublet six deep, so that those who actually labour it are squeezed to the very utmost.'¹⁴ Thus the landlords and their middle-men abdicated the duties of ownership, and sunk into the position of parasites, feeding upon the peasant tenants. They robbed them of their tenant-right by raising their rents, and of their mountain pastures by intruding graziers upon them.

But amid all their hardships the tenants clung to their holdings, and still regarded the land of their old septs as their own legitimate inheritance, as indeed English law under Sir John Davis had admitted it to be. A hundred years are but three generations, and family memories reach through longer periods than this.

Arthur Young, writing in 1774, records that :

The lineal descendants of the old families are now to be found all over the Kingdom working as cottiers on the lands which were once their own. . . . It is a fact that in most parts of the Kingdom the descendants of the old landowners regularly transmit by testamentary deed the memorial of their right to those estates which once belonged to their families.

So then in 1774 the descendants of the old members of the septs were still on the land, possibly still holding divided among them the very tates or homesteads assigned to them before the rebellion by Letters Patent of the Crown.

Mr. Froude quotes a remarkable manifesto of about the same date, which shows how bitterly the hereditary peasant holders resented the robbery of their mountain pastures and the insecurity of their holdings :

Your Honour is sensible that while, of the land which their ancestors held at 4s. or 5s. an acre, they got a few acres at £4 to set potatoes in, they behaved peaceable and quietly. Your Honour is also sensible that the laws of the land have made no provision for them, and that the customs of the country seem to have been appointed for their total destruction and desolation ; upstarts supplanting my poor people on expiration of their leases, and stocking their lands with bullocks.

The facts are on the side of the Irish peasants' hereditary tenant right, for the landlords had left them to follow the hereditary instincts of their old sept organisation by swarming and spreading upon the land. In two centuries the 160,000 Irish cabin homesteads described by Sir William Petty had increased to the number of 600,000 or 700,000 holdings. Half a million fresh homesteads had thus been built by the Irish themselves, and all their surroundings created by the peasants' labour.¹⁵

Need there be any wonder that a custom of tenant right in these half a million cabins should be found to exist at the end of that period, strong enough in some districts to ensure practical recognition though unrecognised by the law ?

The fact is, that the English law of landlord and tenant has never

¹⁴ Froude, i. 279.

¹⁵ It is estimated that it takes from 10*l.* to 14*l.* to reclaim an acre of land worth in its uncultivated state 2*l.* 10*s.*—See *Standard* newspaper's special correspondent, December 9, 1880.

fitted the facts of these peasant tenures. It has failed to control them and change them. In 1870 it had itself to be changed so as to adapt itself to them.

Up to that time the law had ignored the fact even of the Ulster tenant right, though it possessed so strong an inherent reality that even without the law and against the law it was obeyed. Even before the Act of 1870 a railway company taking land under compulsory powers had in practice to buy the tenant's as well as the landlord's interest; and though under no legal obligation to do so had to pay about as much to the tenant as to the landlord before getting peaceable possession of the land.

In 1870 the law had to follow the fact, and by one stroke of the pen the Ulster custom was made law.

In other parts of Ireland the tenants had not succeeded so fully in maintaining their tenant right. But the facts on which tenant right and something like fixity of tenure are based applied elsewhere than in Ulster. Even out of Ulster therefore Mr. Gladstone was compelled in 1870 tardily and with some hesitation to acknowledge the principle of tenant right and permanence by those clauses of his Act which gave compensation for disturbance.

And now the law having once recognised the tenant right is manifestly bound to protect it with the same care as it protects the landlord's ownership. And thus we are brought face to face with the practical question whether after all the cure for the present deadlock between landlord and tenant in Ireland be not the still more full and fair recognition of the facts as they are.

Step by step we have been driven towards it. The law for two hundred years tried to control the facts, and failed in controlling them. In 1870 it conformed itself to the principle involved in the facts. In 1880 the law has to make itself correspond still more closely to them. To perpetuate conflicting interests must be bad policy. To harmonise them on the basis of the actual facts can hardly be objected to by either party. Nor does the full recognition of tenant right involve, as is sometimes supposed, the confiscation of a portion of the landlord's property to give it to the tenant. It is merely the lopping off of overlapping legal rights.

Admit the tenant's right within due limits to permanent occupation and to the protection of the value of his tenant right. This admission involves the recognition of his joint ownership with the landlord in his holding. The recognition of this must involve a limitation in the landlord's right to raise the rent. Exceptional and unscrupulous landlords raise the rent, we are told, wherever they can, and so encroach upon the tenant right. Obviously, they have no right to do this, and ought to be prevented from doing it. The landlord may no doubt justly raise the rent to the limit of the market value of his (the landlord's) own share of the joint holding.

If this rises in value, he has a right to a higher rent in respect of it. But he has no right to any rent at all, accruing solely out of the *tenant right*, i.e. out of the tenant's share in the joint holding, whatever its market value may rise to. This seems obvious and intelligible. Nor is there any real loss to either party in this mutual limitation. The landlord cannot be entitled to a rent from what is not his property. Nor can the tenant claim to occupy the landlord's property without paying a rent for it.

Some practical method of arranging this matter of the rent, according to these clear principles, is obviously a *sine quâ non*, if a *modus vivendi* for landlord and tenant is to be found for the future on the basis of tenant right.

Again, as to the landlord's right of ejectment. Why should the landlord have a right to eject a tenant who has a valuable interest in his holding, so long as the conditions of the joint holding are complied with? Ejectment means a forced sale, or, if a full price cannot be obtained, a partial confiscation of a valuable property. The landlord has, under the Act of 1870, power to eject his tenant without reason, on giving compensation or on allowing the sale of the tenant right at the market price. But the market price in a famine is the price to be obtained by a forced sale, when there are few purchasers. Even the Ulster tenant right fell for the time fifty per cent. in value during the famine of last year. Is then the landlord to be able to choose and watch his time, and buy out the tenant right at half value? This power is certainly not consistent with fully recognised tenant right. Let landlords, on breach of covenant by sub-letting or bad farming, have power to eject and force a sale of the tenant right at the market value; but apart from breach of contract why should the landlord have power to force his tenant to sell his share in the joint ownership? To which side does the permanence of holding matter most? to the landlord who treats his land as an investment, or to the tenant whose holding is his business, his living, and his home? Admitting the fact that the tenure is a peasant tenure, it should not be forgotten that the consensus of civilised Europe has, on the contrary, given the *tenant* the right of buying out his landlord's side of the joint ownership.

The full recognition of tenant right, logically carried out, brings us therefore to the creation of a new form of tenure, analogous in many respects to copyhold and Continental peasant tenures.

Nor does this newly recognised form of tenure seem, so far as we can see, to be economically considered a bad one. It limits the landlord's increase of rent to his own share in any increased value, but it makes the rent absolutely secure as a first charge on the tenant right. It limits his right of ejectment, but takes away the reason for ejectment. Nor is it bad for the tenant. For, after all, the obligation of a fair rent to a landlord is better than getting into the clutches of a

money-lender. The rate of interest paid must be lower, and the position of a tenant with fixity of tenure must be better than that of a mortgagor subject to six months' notice. Few tenants are so overdone with capital that they should, without reason, invest more than is needful at 3 per cent. in land. Finally, if the tenant right be fully secured by the law, and its lines distinctly marked, it would afford almost, if not quite, the same inducement to the tenant to improve the holding as a system of ownership, whilst if subdivision can be guarded against by adequate conditions it would also supply that 'preventive check' to too rapid increase in population which peasant proprietorship supplies. On the other hand, the fact that the landlord remained also interested in the increased value of the land would enlist another interest in local improvements of a wider kind—in the opening out of the natural advantages and resources of the district—all which is of advantage also to the tenant. It also would bring the landlord's capital under local burdens as well as the tenant's, and so enlarge the area over which the stress of temporary calamities can be spread.

There are therefore great economic advantages in the maintenance of both the landlord's and tenant's interests. A country with nothing but peasant holdings, and no other than peasant's capital, would be, economically speaking, open to the evil that it had all its eggs in one basket—that bad harvests would knock the whole country down at once, that its poor rates would fall upon its paupers, and its population be likely to stagnate at the dead level of a low standard of comfort.

Nevertheless, it cannot be denied that there are probably districts where, owing to mutual desire or the hereditary bitterness of the relation of landlord and tenant, it may be needful that the relation should end. To meet these instances extension may be needful of the Bright clauses, *i.e.* of the power given to tenants to buy out the landlord's interests.

Tenant right is no doubt half way towards ownership. I have alluded to the fact that in some places, especially in the mountain districts of the north-west, the pieces included in each peasant holding are scattered all over the townland, and I have said that this condition of things is a survival of the old system of common open fields, known in Ireland and Scotland as the 'rundale' or 'run-rig' system. In such townlands the holdings are almost sure to be emphatically peasant holdings. Common sense would suggest that the proper way to deal with these townlands is by a process akin to what in England is known as enclosure and enfranchisement. In the lifetime of our grandfathers, four thousand Enclosure Acts silently changed the face of the rural parishes of England, sweeping away the remains of old manorial rights from copyhold land. And surely such a silent process always going on, consolidating and separating the

landlord's and the peasant's interest, securing the rights of pasture and perhaps even in some cases buying out the landlord's interest in the whole townland and vesting it in the inhabitants, would afford the best scope for the experiment of peasant proprietorship that could well be obtained; whilst the fact that the process would go on gradually, townland after townland, and year after year, where it was most needed, would awaken life and industry and corporate action in the townlands, at the same time keeping up the feeling everywhere that something was always being done, and that a prospect of progress lay in the future. But this is not the place to enter into details. It is enough to have made the suggestion. No doubt it will be the duty of the law in some way or other to make provisions for peasant proprietorship where the necessities of the case require it. And in this provision, together with the full recognition of the new tenure of tenant right, the solution of the legal problem may perhaps be found.

But I confess that I rise from the study of the economic history of the Irish peasantry with a deep sense that however completely the *legal* problem may be solved, there will still remain an *economic* problem of the greatest gravity.

For the moment, no doubt, the great question is how to make peace between landlord and tenant, and how to restore that spirit of law and order which lies at the root of all real economic progress. The restoration of law and order and an increasing population will no doubt soon restore to the landlord the full value of his qualified ownership. The tenant, too, of a fair-sized holding with a fully acknowledged tenant right will have himself to blame if he do not by thrift and industry become a prosperous semi-proprietor.

But what will become of the tenants of the too small holdings and of the landless class? It is well known that the lot of a labouring class beneath a class of peasant proprietors or peasant occupiers is everywhere exceptionally hard.

It is easy to say that the future of this class may be left to economic laws. But, as we have said, the constitution of human nature is one of the two factors from the interaction of which economic laws arise. And there are two peculiarities of the Irish people which may easily influence for evil their economic future. 1. The tribal instinct is not yet altogether overcome. The instinct of the people is still to swarm and sprawl upon the land. 2. The priestly influence, so powerful over the Irish mind, pulls in the same direction; partly because the priesthood dreads the mixing up of its adherents with those of other creeds, and partly because it is from population that it draws its tributes, and upon population that its maintenance depends. Possibly these influences may be in some measure counteracted by education, and by the firm enforcement of a wisely arranged poor law, which (justice having been done to the

land, its owners, and occupiers) shall justly cast upon the land of a district the honest maintenance of its own pauperism.

But, nevertheless, the economic future of Ireland seems to tremble in the balance between two opposite courses. One is that into which her peculiar national tendencies would lead her, if they were allowed blindly to mould the future. Satisfy the labouring class by giving them land, and the increasing population by bringing more and more of Irish waste lands under cultivation. Satisfy the still increasing demand as one generation succeeds to another by still increasing the supply. What will be the result of this artificial process? When the extreme limits have been reached, the congestion of population will continue under higher pressure than ever until a fresh Irish famine produces another crisis and another exodus.

The other possible future is surely a far more hopeful one. Counteract these peculiar tendencies by a firm resolve to follow that policy which is really economically sound. Resist the temptation artificially to provide for the maintenance of population at too high a level. Wisely accept the fact that the vastly larger proportion of the sons of Ireland as well as of England must in the future dwell across the Atlantic, and therefore at once, and without hesitation, include the other Irelands and Englands across the ocean in the area within which economic laws must be expected to work, and then return to the Irish problem. Compare the waste lands of Ireland with the transatlantic prairies, and instead of asking the question whether it will barely pay to plough up the Irish bog, boldly ask which will pay best, the same labour and capital expended here or there; and according to the answer cultivate the Irish bog or leave it alone. Instead of rooting greater numbers to the soil, let in the daylight of education, and trust to the growth of individual independence and general enlightenment. Open the sluice of emigration as wide as possible till a real level in population is reached, grudging no longer the flow of population to the place where it is most wanted. Never mind if, having done justice to the peasant tenants of Ireland, the free course of economic laws should be found, there as in England, as capital increases, to work in favour of large rather than of small holdings. Rejoice if Irish tenants find a better investment for their capital than can be got from a few poor acres of land, and a wider field for their increasing enterprise and energy than bogs and mountains afford. If *this* should be the result of England's doing justice to Ireland, then the higher happiness and freedom of her sons, wherever they may live, will reflect back a greater prosperity on their old country and upon those who stay at home than any possible ingenuity could secure by making artificial and uneconomical provision for them where they ought not to be.

Ireland, or England for her, must make up her mind which of these two economic futures she wishes to work for!

THE PRESENT ANARCHY.

FOR the past four or five months Ireland has presented a spectacle to which no parallel can be found in any civilised country. Her own miserable annals, indeed, offer only too many parallels, but the fact simply warns us that Irish civilisation is scarcely skin-deep. In some parts of Turkey and Greece there is imperfect security for life and property, but even in those border-lands of Europe there is no organised conspiracy to defeat and trample upon law. In Ireland such a conspiracy has been at work since last summer with fatal success. Early in the autumn the peasants in Mayo and Galway began to boast that 'the English law was broke,' and this is now the language commonly used throughout Connaught and Munster, in a great part of Leinster, and in some districts of Ulster. This popular belief has kept pace with the establishment of the branches of the Land League throughout the country and the working out of the policy long ago proclaimed by Mr. Parnell. Its practical application, however, goes far beyond the avowed limits of the Land League system. The Land League recommends the peasantry to combine for unlawful objects, to enforce by menaces the abrogation of existing contracts and to intimidate all who do not at once yield to the mandate of the Leaguers. But the lesson of lawlessness is carried further by those who are told that legal right may be thrust aside at the bidding of agitators. The small farmers have the strongest inducement to make the system of the Land League effective, and if mere threats of popular displeasure and of a social ban such as that by which Captain Boycott was crushed do not avail, they do not hesitate to extort submission by murder, torture, incendiarism, and cruel mutilation of living animals. 'Boycotting' itself can rarely be made perfect, unless the refusal to carry it into effect is punished by outrage. When obnoxious landlords and agents are placed under the ban, it is necessary for the purposes of the Land League policy that no shop-keeper shall be allowed to deal with them, no artisans or labourers to work for them, no innkeepers to entertain them, no vehicles to carry them, no messengers to bring them letters or telegrams. The same treatment must be rigorously applied to 'land-grabbers,' as farmers are now called who venture to take holdings from which defaulting tenants have been evicted; and to respectable men who knowing

that they hold their land on reasonable terms and are reluctant to break their word, are audacious enough to pay their rents without insisting that the landlord shall accept 'Griffith's valuation.' Against all these classes are employed the weapons of organised agrarian terrorism which have been employed in Ireland during several months with almost complete impunity and with too conspicuous a success over a daily increasing area. In some counties the system has so thoroughly quelled all spirit of resistance that few outrages are any longer needed to enforce the Land League Code. In others the struggle continues, and wherever it is maintained, the record of crime is terribly augmented.

The magnitude of the evil was daringly denied, not by followers of Mr. Parnell only, but by English members for democratic constituencies down to the beginning of December. It was alleged that the amount of crime was exaggerated, and that there was reason to believe that the powers of the 'ordinary law' were being used to keep under control that which existed. Mr. Gladstone himself at the banquet on Lord Mayor's day, intimated that he was still waiting for demonstration of the fact that the ordinary law had failed to cope with the enemies arrayed against it in Ireland. When the Cabinet, after frequent meetings and rumours of dissension on this very question, separated at the end of November without taking steps to obtain additional powers for the Irish Executive, the reports of outrage did not cease or lessen, but 'exaggeration' was the answer in the mouth of every Ministerial apologist. On the opening of the Winter Assizes for Munster, Leinster, and Connaught, the charges of the judges made a full disclosure of the actual state of things. Mr. Justice Fitzgerald in Cork, Mr. Justice Barry in Waterford, and Baron Dowse in Galway had the same tale to tell. Crime has greatly increased in amount since the last summer assizes, and practically it has been unchecked by public justice. It is unnecessary to recapitulate the facts stated in these charges: one or two taken from Baron Dowse's will be sufficient. In Galway (county and city) the police have returned 291 offences of a grave character as having been committed since July last, but only twelve cases have been sent for trial. In Mayo 236 grave offences were returned, and again only twelve cases were for trial. In these two counties 493 persons, 'either through a desire to shield the guilty or through terror,' refuse to give any information by which the criminals could be brought to justice. 'If this state of affairs,' says Baron Dowse, 'is allowed to continue much longer, immediate danger to Ireland will be the consequence and ultimate disgrace to the empire of which she forms a part.' Mr. Justice Barry spoke scarcely less strongly, though in the south-eastern counties the evil had not yet reached the same proportions as in Galway and Mayo. If, he said, even one-tenth of the outrages reported be true, 'no sane and candid man can deny that there exists in many parts of this country a state of things demanding grave and

anxious consideration.' According to Mr. Justice Fitzgerald, 'in nine-tenths at least of the cases of reported criminality, no one has been made amenable;' yet 'in several districts embracing a great part of Munster true liberty has ceased to exist, and an intolerable tyranny prevails. Life is not secure, right is disregarded, the process of the law cannot be enforced, and dishonesty and lawlessness disgrace the land.

It is not too much to say with Mr. Justice Fitzgerald that a criminal organisation, 'acting on the cupidity, the passions, and the fears of the people,' 'had reduced some districts of the country to anarchy and confusion, differing little, if at all, from civil war.' The English sympathisers with the agrarian movement in Ireland denied this down to the last moment. One expositor of Radicalism, writing at the end of November, boldly asserted that 'agrarian murders and outrages have not been frequent,' and attributed the prevailing alarm to the fact that events are viewed 'through the disturbing and exaggerating medium of fear.'¹ The imperturbable courage which refuses in Piccadilly to recognise the dangers threatening other people in Mayo or Kerry is to be admired, but the charges of the Irish judges dispose of the theory that the crisis has merely been developed out of a 'landlords' panic.' The same critic, nevertheless, admitted that if it were shown that 'the operation of the law in its normal state was insufficient, that assassinations, outrages, and other crimes of violence were being committed in alarming or unprecedented number, that constitutional authority had completely collapsed, there would be fair grounds for the institution of coercive measures.' Most persons will be of opinion that the required proof has been abundantly given in the figures cited by the judges. But those figures were not brought to light at the assizes. They have been collected by the county inspectors of constabulary and, as a matter of course, the Government has been made acquainted with them from day to day. Mr. Forster has seen the evidence grow under his eyes since Parliament was prorogued; he was able to lay it before the Cabinet in November, and it is currently believed that he then represented the necessity of giving the Irish Executive peremptory and summary powers for the repression of crime. But if he did so he was overruled by his colleagues, and he did not emphasise his protest in the only effective way, by presenting his resignation as the alternative of the rejection of his policy.

Whatever were the causes which determined the conduct of the Cabinet, and of the Irish Secretary in particular, the fact remains that the 'anarchy and confusion differing little, if at all, from civil war,' which is denounced from the judicial bench, were allowed to make head and to set justice at defiance. The judges lament the impotence of law and the triumph of lawlessness. But the Government has made no sign. The members of the Cabinet, indeed, do

¹ *Fortnightly Review*, 'Home and Foreign Affairs.'

not contradict a report that, when Parliament assembles on January 6, a Coercion Bill is to be introduced. The Irish, however, believe that the hesitation of the Ministry has been due to the threats of Mr. Parnell. The Home Rule leader, who has repeatedly declared that he is working at the land question only as the most convenient line of attack upon the British connection, has declared that he will not allow any measure of coercion to pass, and the peasantry believe him as they believed O'Connell, when he used solemnly to pledge his word that in six months Repeal of the Union would be extorted from England. They are fortified in this belief by the stress which Mr. Bright has laid upon the statement of what is in one sense a truism, and in another an irrelevancy, that 'force is no remedy.' Radical politicians and publicists harp upon this string, and the new Birmingham machine enforces an appearance of unanimity. Meanwhile, Ireland is going from bad to worse, as surely and swiftly as a fire, to extinguish which no efforts have been made, wraps a whole pile of buildings in flame. Mr. Bright and his friends steadily refuse to call the fire-engines, until there has been a scientific inquiry into the origin of the fire, and a law passed to compel the use of safety matches.

It is important to examine carefully the novel application of the doctrine that 'force is no remedy' in which the new Radical policy of dealing with the anarchy in Ireland is founded. There is nothing in the reasoning employed which restricts the conclusion to Ireland. If the mining population of Durham were not only to strike for higher wages, but were to extort concessions by systematic outrage as the 'Molly Maguires' of the Pennsylvania coal-districts succeeded in doing for many years, it would be urged, on these new principles, that no effort ought to be made to put down crime and disorder until grievances had been investigated and redressed. In no civilised society, hitherto, has it been acknowledged that the existence of grievances is a justification of crime, or of systematic defiance of law. It is true that some apologists for anarchy imagine that the Liberal party was formerly identified with a different doctrine; Liberals, it has been asserted,³ have always repudiated 'the doctrine that where widespread disloyalty has arisen from substantial causes submission to the law should precede popular remedies.' Take the strongest case possible—the government of the Second Empire in France or the rule of Austria in Lombardy; did any sane Liberals contend that assassination, with which Napoleon III. was repeatedly menaced, and which struck at many Austrian governors and generals, was not to be punished, so long as those Governments subsisted? Whatever political inferences might be drawn from their acts, it was clear that Orsini and other political assassins had forfeited their lives, and the moral right of the Government they attacked to exact the forfeit was

³ *Spectator*, December 4.

indisputable. In truth, those who use this method of argument do not see where it leads them. What does 'submission to the law' mean? It means that the crimes which at present are perpetrated with impunity in Ireland must be made to cease, by whatever means and whatever the course of Ministerial policy. If Ireland were as badly governed as the kingdom of the Two Sicilies thirty years ago, it would still be as imperative as it is at present to enforce, in some way or other, the elementary securities for life and property without waiting for political reforms. No step in advance can be taken while there is impunity for crime. One may feel shame at being forced to insist upon a point like this; but when it is contested, in bold or ambiguous language, by many Liberal speakers, it is necessary to reassert it in the plainest terms.

A confusion of thought is introduced—not always, I am afraid, undesignedly—between agrarian outrages and the repudiation of existing contracts. Both are examples of the lawless spirit which has sprung up under the influence of the Land League, and in the presence of an impotent legal system and an apathetic Government. But it is to the latter that the apologists for the do-nothing policy turn when they are pressed in argument. It is, they say, of course to be deplored that tenants should refuse to pay their stipulated rents and to surrender possession of their lands upon ejection; but, after all, these are the very rights with which a reform of the land-laws must deal, and it is not unfair to wait for the Parliamentary settlement. The mischievous consequences of this doctrine might be pointed out; but, admitting that it were consistent with justice and public expediency, it covers only a narrow corner of the question. Refusal to pay rent and resistance to eviction are comparatively unimportant factors in the anarchy described in the Judges' charges. But the reign of terror organised throughout the larger part of Ireland can derive no shadow of legality from any changes in the land-laws.³ It will neither

³ Some politicians who ought to know, and do know, better, are not ashamed to repeat the stale calumny that the disorders in Ireland are morally chargeable upon the House of Lords. Mr. Slagg, for instance, one of the members for Manchester—a gentleman who is very indignant with the leaders of his own party because, as he elegantly phrases it, they 'turn up their noses at Home Rule'—traces all the present troubles to the rejection of the Compensation for Disturbance Bill. Mr. Slagg voted for that Bill, but, if it is to be assumed that he honestly means what he says, it is plain that, short as the Bill was, he cannot have read it. The Bill was to come into operation only when tenants were ejected, and when they could show to the satisfaction of the County Court judge that the inability to pay rent was due to the prevailing distress. But during the past six months there have been practically no ejectments in Ireland for the very good reason that, as the Judges tell us, the Queen's writs do not run in that country. Few cases, therefore, have arisen in which the proposed law could have been set in motion. Even, however, if those cases had been far more numerous, the condition set forth in the Bill as the excuse for exceptional legislation would have failed. The 'prevailing distress' has disappeared; a harvest bounteous beyond all recent examples has been reaped and turned into money, and no County Court judge could possibly decide, in the presence of these facts, that the

be more nor less unlawful after a new Land Act has been passed, than it is at present, to commit murder and ferocious assaults, to inflict torture on men and animals, to destroy property by fire or otherwise, and to threaten obnoxious persons with any of these outrages.* Why, then, should the Government make the repression of this terrorism contingent upon legislative reforms? To do so is to tell the Irish people that until they are satisfied by remedial legislation, they must be allowed to be a law unto themselves. They have, in fact, established among them the law of the Land League instead of the law of Parliament, and it is certain that the supremacy of the former will be maintained with the results already manifest unless some means are taken to give public justice new and wider powers. The failure of the ordinary law can no longer be contested. A feeble attempt was made to prove its efficiency by the fact that under the protection of a large body of soldiers the relief expedition from Ulster was able to gather in Captain Boycott's crops. At that very time, however, in other parts of Ireland 'Boycotting' was going on merrily, but the Lough Mask rescue has not been repeated. Even in Mayo itself, the presence of the soldiery guarding Lord Erne's unfortunate agent did not check for a moment or in the slightest degree the operations of the terrorists. Another explanation has been more recently devised. It is asserted that the ordinary law has failed to repress crime in Ireland because it has not been put in force with vigour, and Mr. Forster's circular to the Irish magistrates is pointed to as showing that existing powers have been neglected. But if this be so, in what position does it leave the Government? The Irish magistrates⁴ as well as the Irish constabulary are directly controlled from the Castle, and if the law has deliberately stayed its hand while crime was being perpetrated on an appalling scale, the responsibility must rest with the Chief Secretary and the Lord-Lieutenant. It is impossible to say what mischievous inference may not have been drawn, before the meaning of the facts grew as plain as it is now, from the misleading phrase 'force is not a remedy.'

But there is no reason to suppose that the Irish Government was guilty of this *laches*. The incapacity of the ordinary law to grapple with agrarian crime in Ireland has been repeatedly demonstrated in Parliament, and most conclusively in 1871 by two members of the present Cabinet, Lord Kimberley in the Upper House and Lord Hartington in the Lower House. But it had been shown to exist on many former occasions. Popular movements fomented by agitation

non-payment of rent was due to 'the act of God.' The Disturbance Bill would have been a dead letter, as Mr. Parnell frankly admits, when he says that he would himself have insured its rejection if he had not seen that the House of Lords were certain to throw it out as an unwarrantable and purposeless attack on property.

⁴ It must be borne in mind that the most active portion of the Irish magistracy consists of the residents or stipendiaries, who are Government officials.

drifted into terrorism ; the law was successfully defied, evidence being impossible to procure, arrests being systematically obstructed, and convictions being generally unattainable. Remedial measures were of no avail in such a condition of things ; as Lord Hartington said in moving for the Westmeath committee of inquiry : ‘ I cannot see on what possible ground it could be imagined that the establishment of equal and just legislation should have any effect on the minds of men who have a system of laws of their own—not just laws, but the most unjust, the most arbitrary, the most tyrannical, and the most barbarous.’ In every case, coercion has had sooner or later to be applied, and the longer the delay in applying it, the more rigorous did it necessarily become in the end. It never failed to check crime, and those who condemn it are bound to show that the cessation of outrage is not in itself a gain to society. Be the political and social system bad or good, it must be better that life and property should be safe than that men should go by day and night in fear of the assassin, the incendiary, and the cattle-houger. Force is a remedy, so far, and those who refuse to apply it for this purpose when they are in power, are morally responsible for all the crime they might have prevented by promptitude and energy.

It is scarcely remembered in these days with what a defiant parade of force O’Connell’s last emancipation campaign was crowned. The march of Mr. Lawless into Ulster at the head of thirty thousand Catholics frightened even the Catholic leaders, and Shiel bitterly upbraided the Wellington Administration with their apathy. ‘ The Cabinet,’ he said, ‘ is little better than a box in an amphitheatre from whence her Majesty’s Ministers may survey the business of blood.’ The collision was averted by the wise assent of the Government to the popular demand, but the spirit of triumphant violence was not so easily laid. O’Connell, having vanquished the Tories, was determined to force the hand of the Whigs. In 1831, he set at defiance a proclamation issued by the Lord-Lieutenant, was indicted, and allowed judgment to go against him by default. The Government stated in Parliament that it was their ‘ unalterable determination ’ to ‘ let the law take its course against him ; ’ but the general election was approaching, ministers swallowed their scruples, and O’Connell was never brought up for judgment. He was not the man to abstain from pressing an advantage through scruples of generosity. He was active at this very time in stirring up the popular passions which presently blazed up in the ‘ tithe war.’ In the Speech from the Throne at the opening of Parliament in 1832, the attention of the Legislature was directed to ‘ the systematic opposition to the payment of tithes in Ireland.’ The tithe system was a thoroughly bad one, but the representation of it as a grievous burden upon the peasantry is not consistent with the facts. It was rather a worrying than a crushing impost. It was officially stated in the House of

Commons that in one parish in Carlow, the sum owing by 222 defaulters was one farthing each. 'A return of the actual number of defaulters whose debts were under a farthing, and rise by farthings up to a shilling, would exhibit a very large proportion of the gross number. In some instances the charge upon the land amounted to only seven parts of a farthing. . . . Many of the smaller sums were payable by three or four persons. . . . The highest aggregate charge was against those who owed individually about twopence.' But stimulated by the great agitator the peasantry rose against tithes as in a struggle for life and death. A writer of strong Radical opinions describes the state of affairs that followed:—'Tithe-collectors were murdered in some places; in others they were dragged from their beds and laid in a ditch to have their ears cut off. Five of the police were shot dead at once by a party in ambush. The peasantry declared against pastures, and broke up grass-lands in broad day. Cattle were driven off lest the owners should pay tithe upon them.' In November, 1831, 'when a strong body of police were escorting a tithe-collector, they were summoned to surrender him to popular vengeance, and on their refusal, twelve of them were slaughtered in a lane and more left fearfully wounded. The captain of police and his son, ten years old, were among the slain, and the pony which the boy rode was stabbed dead. . . . A country lad who appeared to be about thirteen years old went from one to another of the prostrate police, and finding that five of them still breathed, made an end of them with his scythe.' These outrages had the effect designed. They established a reign of terror. 'If any resident pressed by his conscience, or by his pastor, or by fear of the law, paid the smallest amount of tithe in the most secret manner, his cattle were houghed in the night, or his house was burnt over his head, or his flock of sheep were hunted over a precipice and lay a crushed heap in the morning. There was a sound of a horn at that time which made men's flesh creep whether it was heard by night or by day; for those who took upon them to extinguish tithes now boldly assembled their numbers by the sound of the horn, and all who heard it knew that murder or mutilation or arson was going to be committed. Captures, special commissions, and trials, were useless. Witnesses dared not give evidence; jurors dared not attend.' The Government bowed to the storm and passed a relief act, lending a sum of money to the clergy and undertaking itself to collect the arrears of tithe for 1831. In the following year Ministers had to admit that out of arrears amounting to 104,000*l.* they had been able to levy only 12,000*l.*, which had been collected with great difficulty and some loss of life. The agitators and the peasantry had thus carried their point. But the social war did not subside. Terrorism was vainly encountered with police and soldiery. It was in this situation that the first Reformed Parliament met in 1833, when Lord Grey's Government im-

mediately brought in a most stringent Coercion Bill. It was shown that since 1829, serious crimes had increased sixteenfold. Lord Althorp stated with his accustomed temperate force the argument of the Government:—‘We shall, doubtless, have divers declamations in praise of liberty, which no man wishes to gainsay; but the question is, Is it from a state of liberty that Ireland is to be rescued? Is she not to be rescued from a state of great and severe tyranny? Is she not to be rescued from a state of anarchy, where life has no safety and property no security? Liberty is something more than a name, and the benefits of liberty are the protection of life and property, the protection of every man in doing that which pleases himself and is not detrimental to society.’ The view taken by the main body of the Whigs was brilliantly illustrated by Macaulay during the debates on the address:—‘The grievances of Ireland,’ he said, ‘are, doubtless, great, so great that I never would have connected myself with a Government which I did not believe to be intent on redressing those grievances. But am I, because the grievances of Ireland are great, to abstain from redressing the worst grievance of all? Am I to look on quietly while the laws are insulted by a furious rabble, while houses are plundered and burned, while my peaceable fellow-subjects are butchered? The distribution of Church property, you tell us, is unjust. Perhaps I agree with you. But what then? To what purpose is it to talk of the distribution of Church property when no property is secure? Then you try to deter us from putting down robbery, arson, and murder, by telling us that if we resort to coercion we shall raise a civil war. We are past that fear. . . . Civil war, indeed! I would rather live in the midst of any civil war that we have had in England for the last two hundred years than in some parts of Ireland at the present moment. . . . It is idle to threaten us with civil war, for we have it already, and it is because we are resolved to put an end to it that we are called base and brutal and bloody.’ The Radicals, however, joined with the O’Connellites in resisting the Bill, and especially the clause giving powers to courts-martial to try certain classes of offences. It became law, nevertheless, on the 2nd of April, and its effect was instantly apparent. Serious crimes in the disturbed districts during the month before the passing of the Act numbered 472; in the month following they were reduced to 162. And this result was attained mainly by the moral influence of the resolution shown by Ministers. Not a single court-martial was even summoned.

After Lord Grey’s resignation and the dismissal of Melbourne, a new alliance was formed between O’Connell and the Liberals. At the General Election of 1835, the Opposition had the full advantage of the Liberator’s support. The manner in which the campaign was carried on did not tend to tranquillise the people. ‘Everyone,’ said O’Connell to the electors of his own county, ‘who dares to vote for the Knight of Kerry shall have a death’s head and crossbones painted

on his door.' Of another candidate he said, 'Whoever shall support him his shop shall be deserted; no man shall pass his threshold; let no man deal with him; let no woman speak to him; let the children laugh him to scorn.' Shiel went even further: speaking of a Conservative politician, he said, 'If any Catholic should vote for him, I will supplicate the throne of the Almighty that he may be shown mercy in the next world, but I ask no mercy for him in this.' When the Whigs returned to power they found that the excitement had produced a recrudescence of violence, and in 1835, Lord Morpeth's Coercion Bill, milder than Lord Grey's, but still sufficiently stringent, was passed. This was allowed to expire in 1840. During its continuance there was a steady decline in the amount of agrarian crimes, of which 10,229 were committed in 1837; 6,760 in 1838; 4,626 in 1839, and 4,069 in 1840. In 1841, coercion being suspended, crimes of this class rose to 5,370; in 1844 to 6,327, and in 1845 to 8,095. In 1846, Sir Robert Peel introduced his Protection of Life Bill upon statements and arguments precisely corresponding with those on which Lord Grey's Bill was founded. Outrage and anarchy, it was shown, were confined to particular districts; but in those they had reached such a height 'as to have entirely paralysed the arm of the law as it stands, and established, practically speaking, an entire impunity for crimes of the most atrocious description. It is not merely the number of offences, but the paucity of convictions which is the alarming circumstance.' In five counties in 1845, the number of indictable offences reported was 1,188, and the convictions only 84. It was notorious that a great number of outrages were unrecorded, because the victims feared to give information to the police. The Bill was defeated by a combination of Protectionists, Whigs, and Repealers; but no one professed to believe that it fell upon its own merits. Its rejection was Sir Robert Peel's punishment for his conversion to free trade. It is difficult to believe that Lord John Russell, at any period in his public career, could have felt shame for any of his public acts. Yet it is not less difficult to understand how he could have failed to blush when a month after Sir Robert Peel's resignation the Whigs had to produce an Arms Bill, afterwards withdrawn through fear of a rupture with O'Connell. In 1847, however, no political inconveniences were permitted to obstruct the enactment of a Crime and Outrage Act stronger than that proposed in the previous year by Sir Robert Peel.

On every one of these occasions the evidence produced to show that an increase of the powers of the Executive were needed was in effect the same. There was a conspiracy which, partly by working on the fears of the people and partly by enlisting their sympathies, was able to carry out its objects by the perpetration of crime and to avoid detection and punishment. Liberal and Conservative ministers in those days believed that if they allowed law to be thus trampled

upon they would be morally guilty of complicity in the permitted crimes. But the modern school of Radicalism are of a different opinion. If its spokesmen had been in Parliament in 1833 or in 1847, they would, no doubt, have opposed the Coercion Bills of Lord Grey and Lord John Russell with their favourite maxim, 'force is no remedy.' But neither is a strait-jacket a remedy for a man in raging delirium, yet for his own sake and that of others it may be necessary to restrain him from violence. The patient, indeed, must be prevented from stripping off his clothes and brandishing an open razor, whatever may be the method of treatment adopted, whether 'the fever be allowed to take its course,' or lenitives or stimulants be administered.

It thus appears that former governments, Whig and Tory, did not hesitate when law was overridden and life and property menaced in Ireland, to obtain extraordinary repressive powers from Parliament. But Radicalism of the Birmingham type is contemptuous of the 'bad old methods' which were approved in the benighted time before the extension of the suffrage and the invention of the caucus compelled members for the large borough constituencies to pay a perpetual tribute to the Irish vote. Let us come down, however, to a later period when the *Di Majores* of latter-day Liberalism occupied, as they do now, the Olympian regions of office. In 1868, the Conservative party suffered ruinous defeat. Mr. Gladstone came into power with full authority to tranquillise Ireland by remedial legislation, and availed himself amply of his opportunities. Yet in the year following the disestablishment of the Irish Church, when Mr. Gladstone's Administration was undertaking the task of revising ('positively for the last time') the relations of landlord and tenant in Ireland, there was an outbreak of agrarian crime so threatening that the progress of the Land Bill had to be postponed in order that Mr. Chichester Fortescue should be allowed to introduce a Peace Preservation Bill.⁵ This measure embraced stringent and complex provisions for dealing with agrarian conspiracy, outrage, and sedition; it was more severe than any Coercion Act previously brought in except Lord Grey's. But in certain parts of the country it failed to vindicate the supremacy of the law. During the winter of 1870-71, the outcry of the orderly inhabitants of Westmeath and some neighbouring districts became too great for the Government to ignore, although Ministers were unwilling directly to eat their own words, and sheltered themselves under a reference to a Parliamentary Committee. As to the facts, there was really no matter for inquiry. It was known beforehand to the Government that in the disturbed districts there was, as has been said, 'a regular organised system among them (the peasantry)

⁵ Mr. Bright was at this time a member of the Cabinet, though he ceased to be so in the following December, owing to ill-health, and was out of office when Lord Hartington's Bill was passed.

to oppose the law when they think fit, to exercise an entire control over the disposition of property and the receipt of rent.' But as has always happened, terrorism did not stop short with the relations of landlord and tenant, but began to extend to all kinds of business and especially to apply coercion to the Midland Railway Company of Ireland, the main line of which passes through Westmeath. Early in the session of 1871, Lord Hartington made a statement which, he said, filled his mind with 'painful dismay.' The Peace Preservation Act had generally put down outrage, but in Westmeath and parts of Meath and King's County it had failed to cope with the terrorist organisation.

'The reports we receive,' he said, 'show that such a state of terrorism prevails that the Riband Society has only to issue its edict to secure obedience; nor has it even to issue its edict; its laws are so well known, and an infringement of them is followed so regularly by murderous outrage, that few indeed can treat them with defiance. Riband law, and not the law of the land, appears to be that which is obeyed. It reaches to such an extent that no landlord dare exercise the most ordinary of rights pertaining to land, and no farmer, employer, or agent dare exercise his own judgment as to whom he shall or shall not employ; in fact, so far does the influence of the society extend that a man scarcely dare enter into open competition in the fairs or markets with anyone known to belong to the society.'

This, he concluded, was an intolerable state of things. But it was even less tolerable that in scarcely a single instance was it found possible to bring the guilty to account for crimes which were notorious and flagrant. Injured persons dared not give information, witnesses dared not give evidence, jurors would not serve, or let it be known that they would rather be fined, or even perjure themselves, than be subjected to the unknown and appalling penalties of the terrorist code. Lord Hartington reminded the House of Commons that from these causes a great part of the machinery of terrorism did not appear in the official statistics; but enough was shown to convince Parliament that a drastic remedy was needed. I have already quoted Lord Hartington's manful statement that, in his opinion, the organisers and agents of the terror neither had been nor would be affected by any improvements in the land laws or other concessions to the popular claims.

The report of the Select Committee fully confirmed Lord Hartington's statement, and the conclusions arrived at laid bare a state of things precisely resembling that which has now spread over the larger part of Ireland, but which was then confined to Westmeath, and parts of the adjoining counties. There was no other alternative before the Government save to acquiesce in the victory of lawlessness, or to give the Executive the power of summarily arresting suspected persons, and detaining them without trial for such time as

might appear necessary. Every other repressive agency, short of martial law, had been embodied in the Peace Preservation Act, and had, it was admitted, completely failed. Powers of summary arrest had been proved to be efficacious during the political disturbances of 1848-49, and again during the Fenian troubles in 1866-68. On both occasions the Habeas Corpus Act had been suspended by a Liberal Ministry. It was generally acknowledged, however, that the powers granted to the Irish Executive had been exercised with scrupulous care, and that it would be difficult to abuse them while the right of Parliament to criticise was deferentially recognised. There was no parity of conditions between the suspension of the constitutional liberties of the subject which was entrusted to Viceroy-like Lord Clarendon, Lord Kimberley, the Duke of Abercorn, and Lord Spencer, and that which had been the object of popular suspicion and hatred in the days of Lord Sidmouth and Lord Castle-reagh. When, therefore, the question arose what measures should be taken to put down the reign of terror in Westmeath, the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act was suggested as likely to be effectual. The suggestion was criticised by the same sort of politicians as those who would now allow law and liberty to be trodden under foot in Ireland rather than break some loose and reckless pledges given in the wanton irresponsibility of Opposition. It is unnecessary to recall them. There was one pedantic argument, however, which had at that time some weight, but can no longer be resorted to. It was urged that the Habeas Corpus Act had never previously been suspended except in relation to political offences of the gravest character. The obvious answer was that the temporary curtailment of personal liberties might be more safely entrusted to the Executive in the case of agrarian terrorism than in the case of political conspiracy. A Government might conceivably be tempted to rid itself of inconvenient political opponents by arresting them on suspicion, but could have no ulterior object in arresting persons suspected of agrarian crime. At all events, whatever weight the objection had in 1871 has been taken away by the precedent then created. The Westmeath Act, dealing with the deplorable state of things disclosed in the Report of the Select Committee, gave the Lord Lieutenant in Council authority to order the seizure and detention of persons suspected of complicity in agrarian crime in the proclaimed districts. Lord Kimberley, in his speech upon the introduction of the Bill in the Upper House, confessed that it was painful to have to propose a restriction of the constitutional liberties of the subject. 'But,' he added, 'there is something yet more painful, and that is the spectacle of crime unpunished, and of a great conspiracy overriding and defying the law; and when it is shown that the remedies which have been already employed are insufficient, Her Majesty's Government do not shrink from asking Parliament to give them further

powers.' The Bill became law in spite of predictions that it would fail, and of asseverations that 'force was no remedy.' But immediately after the meeting of Parliament in the following year, the Attorney-General for Ireland (Mr. Dowse, now one of the judges) was able to state that there had been a vast improvement in the condition of the proclaimed districts, an improvement so great that some Home Rule members contended that the necessity for coercion had ceased. The Act, however, was allowed to continue in force for the fixed period of two years. It acted almost as the menace of martial law in Lord Grey's Coercion Act had done—by moral pressure. It taught the people that the Government was really in earnest, and that crime would not be permitted to secure impunity behind legal technicalities and the fears or sympathies of the peasantry. Before the Bill passed, it became known to the police that many of the leading spirits in the agrarian confederacy had quitted the country. The Attorney-General stated that 'four persons only had been arrested (during the nine months, from May 1871 to February 1872, in which the tranquillisation of Westmeath had been effected) under the provisions of the Act, and of those three only remained in custody.'

This remarkable chapter of legislation must have been in the recollection of the Government when it became evident during the autumn that a similar system of terrorism was being established in several of the Irish counties. Even in October, after the murders of Mr. Boyd, Lord Mountmorres, and Mr. Hutchins, servant, a timely proclamation of five or six well-marked districts under the Westmeath Act, had it been in force, would almost certainly have stopped the spread of lawlessness. This was, it is well known, the opinion of almost every official person in Ireland and of the great majority of persons experienced in magisterial business. But the Chief Secretary did not insist on consulting his colleagues, and while anarchy advanced with giant strides, the Cabinet was not called together until the day following the Lord Mayor's banquet. On that occasion the Lord Chancellor asserted firmly that the paramount duty of Government was to provide security for life and property, and Mr. Gladstone said that, if 'clear demonstration' of necessity were afforded, the Ministry would not shrink from asking Parliament for extraordinary powers. Week after week has passed and nothing has been done to redeem this pledge. There have been frequent meetings of the Cabinet, and rumours of dissension among Ministers; but no step has been taken to make the law obeyed in Ireland, or to protect law-abiding men in the enjoyment of their lives and liberties. The facts set forth in the judges' charges must have been in the possession of the Government almost in their complete form at the first Cabinet meeting. For what 'clearer demonstration' Mr. Gladstone has been waiting, before giving proof that his recognition at the Guildhall of 'the priority of the duty

before any other of enforcing the law for the purposes of order,' was not mere lip-service, may perhaps be explained to a sympathetic House of Commons. The task, however, will be far more difficult in February than it would have been three months earlier. The machinery of terrorism has been extended: its agents have been multiplied, and have found apt pupils throughout the whole of the south and west of Ireland. Fear has palsied whole sections of Irish society, and has done irreparable injury to Irish trade and industry. The value of landed property has been for the time annihilated; no man will invest capital upon any sort of Irish security, and soon, it is too probable, nobody will venture to give credit to an Irish mercantile firm. While intimidation is applied to every person suspected of being ill-affected to Mr. Parnell's government and laws, the ulterior objects of the movement are not forgotten. Behind the cupidity of the peasantry there is a design to make Ireland an impossible country to live in for those who are proscribed as 'the English garrison.' The loyal element in Irish society, the great body of the professional and the cultivated classes, the ablest and most successful men of business, even though they may not have 'as much land as would sod a lark,' are to be hounded out of the country in the train of the landlords, because they are Protestant and Saxon. In the meantime they are being made to drink the cup of humiliation to the dregs. The Catholics under the penal law were not more prostrate or more shamefully insulted. 'The law as it stands,' the fetish of the Radicals, is dead and despised as Dagon.

It is related that at a critical moment in the French Revolution of 1848, during the terrible 'days of June,' a member of the Republican Government spent the precious hours wringing his hands, and exclaiming 'Il faut prendre des mesures! Il faut prendre des mesures!' One is reminded of this valuable contribution to the solution of a question which was one of life and death for French society, by the feeble and vacillating speeches of Liberal politicians. Take that excellent 'high and dry' Radical, Mr. Dillwyn, who, addressing his constituents at Swansea a month ago, told them that 'so long as the Queen's Government is to be the Government of Ireland, law and order, life and property must be protected, and no doubt strong measures would have to be used.' But after this vigorous assertion of the duty and necessity which have not yet been acted upon by the Ministry of the Crown—'prave 'orts,' as his countryman, Captain Fluellen, would have said—Mr. Dillwyn recoils from the notion of suspending the Habeas Corpus Act, for the strangely incorrect reason that 'practically it meant putting Ireland under military law.' What conception of military or martial law was in Mr. Dillwyn's mind it would be futile to inquire. The absurd error, however, has been repeated in a variety of forms, and probably some vindicators of constitutional liberty will produce it again in the coming Parliamentary

debates. A signal incapacity to put real meaning into language, and to stick to it, is the mark of official and unofficial speeches on the Ministerial side. Is it to continue to paralyse the policy of the Government, when Parliament is at length consulted?

The delay has rendered it more than doubtful whether a simple suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act will now be sufficient to do what must be done, although it must form a part of the coercive measures to be adopted. In October or November the arrest of perhaps a dozen well-known local organisers of terrorism would have broken down the system, not only because the masses in Ireland are easily led and singularly timid when left without leaders, but still more because Irish conspirators deeply distrust one another, and not without cause. The arrest of a few 'leaders'—I do not mean political spouters, but the men who plan and carry out a system of outrage and intimidation—strikes dismay into the hearts of their accomplices, their tools and their dupes, who suspect, reasonably enough, that the imprisoned persons will purchase their own safety by giving information respecting undetected crimes. There is a sudden flight of the worst, and a desperate effort on the part of the rest to show by their conduct that they are innocent industrious people, who have never dreamed of wielding the rod of 'Rory.' Even after the conflagration has been permitted to rage so long unchecked, these influences may be able to make themselves felt, but they will have to be supplemented probably by the re-enactment of the most stringent provisions of Mr. Chichester Fortescue's Peace Preservation Act of 1870, and the new coercive law must be enforced consistently and without remission for a long period. Such is the necessity which Liberal Ministers have created for themselves by neglect of duties they continued to acknowledge in word while they rejected them in deed. As for the 'caucuses' and their organs, which have been proclaiming that a Liberal Government is bound to show the 'difference' between it and a Conservative Government by refusing to coerce at all, they will doubtless discover that public opinion is shifting, and will then assure the world that they have always been in favour of making life and property secure in Ireland, and of exacting obedience to the law. But the significance of the history of these months cannot be mistaken, and will not, I hope, be soon forgotten.

EDWARD D. J. WILSON.

THE THREE "F'S."

IN attempting to offer any suggestion on the land question, I am aware that I must, to a great degree, travel over ground that has been most ably dealt with by eminent writers ; and, in fact, I do not pretend to throw any new light on the subject, my object being to bring afresh to general notice the more salient suggestions that have of late been so profusely put before the public.

In order to do so, it will be necessary to consider the conditions of the three principal points likely to be reported upon by the Land Commission, viz., the existing tenure in the Southern and Western provinces of Ireland, more particularly those of Leinster and Munster ; secondly, the extension into those provinces of tenant-right ; thirdly, the conversion of the present occupiers into freeholders.

I believe that I shall but express the wishes of the great majority of the landowners and occupiers, when I say that they hope and expect from the present Government a measure that will be final in its settlement, and that will bring to an end the intolerable deadlock at present arresting the progress and prosperity of their common country. It was foreseen from the first, by one who knew Ireland and the people well, that the Land Act of 1870 could not be a final settlement. He, objecting strongly as he did, on principle, to the disturbance clauses, held that difficulty would arise, not so much from what was embodied in the Act, as from what that class of legislation would infallibly lead an excitable people to seek for through agitation.

The result has but too well justified his forebodings. The rude tests of adverse harvests have obliterated the short-lived prosperity that prevailed during the first few years following on the passing of the Act, and anarchy prevails.

With regard to the agitation of the Land League under the guidance of Mr. Parnell, I have but little to say. The whole conduct of the League is at present undergoing the test of a legal prosecution, and the question whether or no they have offended against the law of conspiracy is foreign to the permanent settlement of the land question. We may accept the assurance of Mr. Herbert Gladstone, that the Government wish to exhaust all the existing powers of the law before applying to Parliament for coercive legislation. I cannot, however, pass over the subject without directing attention to the fact that the partially avowed object of the agitation is mainly directed against the

existence of large, and even of moderate-sized, holdings. It would be well for the substantial class of farmers in Ireland, whether Roman Catholic or Protestant, to remember that, if the extreme views of the Land League could be carried out, and all landlords compulsorily deported, the virulence of the agitation would be directed against themselves. As proof of this may be adduced Mr. Parnell's remedy for the distress existing amongst the over-populated districts of the West, viz., transmigration to the more fertile lands of Leinster and Munster, as opposed to emigration to our colonies and the United States. It should be borne in mind, that the big words of the agitation would matter but little were it not for the notorious fact that Ireland is full of arms. One thing is certain, that the country will insist upon the law being respected and enforced, and it is satisfactory to see that the Premier and the Lord Chancellor, in their speeches at the Mansion House, expressed their intentions of doing all in their power to secure this object. The former stated in the House of Commons that Ireland was within a measurable distance of 'civil war.' I believe that if with the approaching winter outrages and assassinations continue and increase, Ireland will find herself within a measurable distance of 'Vigilance Committees,' a state of things far more deplorable and more disastrous to the reputation of the Government of a civilised country.

Before entering on the question of the land tenure, I should protest against the manner in which landlords have been attacked for availing themselves of the provisions in their favour in the Land Act of 1870; notably so in the case of the 'Leinster leases,' which raised, at the time they were offered to the tenants on the Duke of Leinster's property, a storm of abuse. I believe that, upon examination, this lease will be found to contain nothing that the Act does not permit, and even encourage. Even the late Mr. Butt stated that there was nothing in the lease that could be construed as straining the provisions of the Act.

There is an assertion that is constantly made by the advocates of the tenants, viz., that the permanent improvements of the land are invariably and entirely the work of the tenants. This statement must be accepted with reservation, for on the estate of the large resident proprietors, more especially in Leinster and Munster, it will be found to have but little foundation in fact. It is, however, maintained by Mr. Robertson, one of the ablest of the writers on the land question, in a letter of some length to the *Daily News* of the 2nd of October. He indeed qualifies his assertion by admitting that landlords do sometimes improve, but says that when it is done with money borrowed from the Board of Works, the improvement is in reality made by the tenant if he be called upon to pay an increased and fair rent for the increased value of the land. I fail to see, when the land is permanently improved at the landlord's expense and risk, what

difference it can make to the tenant where the money comes from, whether from the landlord's own private means, or from money raised on his own personal security, or whether it be borrowed from the Board of Works on the security of the land. I have not yet heard of any parallel case in England—viz., that if improvements are carried out with money lent by 'Land Improvement Companies,' the English tenant is in the habit of claiming the improvement as his own, if he be called upon to pay an increased rent. I believe, too, that it will be found, on the large estates especially, that 'bonâ fide' improvements by the tenants are the rare exceptions, and that landowners in this respect hold their own with their compeers in England and Scotland. On the estates in the West, occupied wholly by cottier tenants, and where also the burden of the poor-rate on holdings rated under 4*l.* is borne entirely by the landlord, there is naturally no incentive for him to improve, as he would do so at an expense disproportionate to any benefit conferred on the estate generally. Moreover, it is difficult in England to realise the opposition raised by the tenants of this class to permanent improvements, such as drainage, or the demolition and straightening of the huge and tortuous fences, mostly measuring from seven to ten yards in width, which were so strongly condemned by Lord Spencer during his viceroyalty.

There is, too, a great deal of loose talk about the reclamation of waste land. Putting aside the half-drained land, that would pay well to thoroughly reclaim, it would be manifestly absurd and throwing money away to attempt to reclaim the surface of the peat-bogs so long as there is an average depth of from twelve to twenty feet of pure peat underneath; moreover, from their being the chief source of fuel supply, it would be waste of labour to reclaim the surface which would be cut gradually away as the turf-banks encroach. The surface, too, of cut-away bogs barely repays the outlay of reclamation. It would be better and more for the benefit of the country if they were, as wisely recommended by Mr. P. J. Smyth, M.P., largely and systematically planted.

The so-called advantages of tenant-right to the tenant are well known. The outgoing tenant is almost certain, after paying the unpaid balance of rent, of receiving a sum of money sufficient probably in all cases to enable him to emigrate or otherwise to provide for himself.

Tenant-right, too, would be acceptable to the majority of absentee landlords, and to a great number of the land agents. It would be acceptable to those landowners whose only interest in, and connection with, the land is the punctual and certain payment of their rents, without any care for the character or suitability of their tenants or for the improvement of their properties. In this category I do not include the large absentee proprietors, on whose properties the outlay is as large and as judiciously applied as on their estates in England.

But I refer more particularly to the smaller absentees, many of whom are English, unwilling and unable to grant reductions when the pinch of bad harvests and low prices is felt by their tenants; to these I believe the establishment of tenant-right, with the certainty of recovering the unpaid rents out of the purchase-money paid by the incoming tenant, would be a boon. For this same reason also tenant-right might be acceptable to some of the land-agents. It would probably also relieve them of the preparation and carrying out of improvements, which would be obviously arrested and discouraged on the estates where tenant-right was introduced; they would be left with no duties to perform, save the collection of the half-yearly rents, but they forget that the natural outcome will be that proprietors will employ a lower class of agent at a reduced cost to themselves. In writing this I do not wish to cast a slur on a body of gentlemen who have so honourably and zealously endeavoured to do their duty, both to their employers and also to the tenantry under their charge, often at great personal risk.

The disadvantages of tenant-right can hardly be said to apply personally either to landlord or tenant, but to the soil itself; where an incoming tenant has to pay a large, and in some cases a disproportionate, sum for the interest in a farm, and in doing so exhausts not only his own capital, but also all the means that he can raise, frequently at exorbitant interest, it is plain that the soil cannot receive that cultivation and proper application of manures necessary to preserve its inherent fertility.

If, however, it is considered necessary to extend tenant-right, in a greater or lesser degree, over the Southern and Western provinces of Ireland, it would be well to refer to Mr. Justice Longfield's very able article in the *Fortnightly Review* for August, in which he proposes a novel system of tenant-right. The writer appears to me at the outset to dismiss, without adequate reason, the possibility of enabling occupiers to become owners of the fee-simple of their farms. He clearly points out the reasons for the popularity of tenant-right with land-agents, and he also shows plainly the objects and advantages of the office rules on the estates in Ulster. His proposed plan (p. 143), as to the buying out of the tenant by the landlord, in the event of disagreement as to the rent, appears very feasible; but I think his plan for regulating the rent, when it can be proved that the improvements have been made by the tenant, is complicated. In that case it would be simpler to deduct a certain rate of interest on the value of the unexhausted improvements from any increased rent demanded by the landlord, leaving, however, the option to the latter of paying down the said unexhausted value, and of thenceforward receiving the full rent.

When the question of extending the Ulster tenant-right arises, it will be well to call to mind the dissatisfaction felt by the tenants

who live under it, which is expressed with moderation by those who live in the more orderly counties. The causes of dissatisfaction are the rules existing on some of the estates; such as the right of veto on the incoming tenant; the limitation of the number of years' purchase of the rent; and the occasional revaluation of the same. Concerning the first of these causes of dissatisfaction, it is difficult to understand why, if the landlord is supposed to retain any interest in the management of his property, not only for his own sake, but also in the interests of the remainder of his tenantry, he should not have the power to object to a man, who may be of bad character, ignorant of agriculture, or unprovided with sufficient capital to work the farm. As to the second one, it is obvious, as I have before pointed out, that the land must suffer if the incoming tenant be permitted to exhaust the whole of his capital by paying an exorbitant price for the tenant-right. Besides, cases may arise, such as that of a farm in the neighbourhood of a rising town, where, if the landlord wishes to resume possession of the holding for the purpose, say, of granting building leases, it would be obviously unfair that he should be called upon to pay his tenant a larger sum than what really represents the inherent value of the farm as an agricultural holding. With regard to the third, it is the fashion, occasionally, to talk of landlord and tenant as coequal partners, yet at the same time, one of them, the landlord, is to be denied his share in the increased value of his property arising from enhanced prices and the depreciated value of money.

There is another solution to the land question which is supported by the party represented in the press by the *Freeman* newspaper: 'Fixity of tenure, Fair rents, Free sale,' a bill of fare so lengthy that it is popularly expressed as the three F's; perhaps I may be permitted to suggest another term more intelligible to English ears—namely, 'Leases for ever.'

But, if we take the three F's one by one, I think we shall find that the first, 'Fixity of tenure,' exists all over Ireland, North and South, except in the case of non-payment of rent. It is, I believe, the very rarest exception for a yearly tenant to be evicted for any of the reasons for which he would be in England or Scotland, such as bad or slovenly farming.

'Fair rents;' if by this proposal is meant that the rents should be submitted to arbitration, I feel sure that it would be welcome to the great body of Irish landlords; in the case of the majority of them, their incomes would probably be increased by half as much again.

'Free sale;' if by this is meant that the interest in a holding may be sold to the highest bidder, irrespective of control, I think it objectionable for reasons I have given before. It is indeed hard to understand what is meant by the expression. The agent for Lord

Cork's estates in the county of Cork is reported to have said, in his evidence before the Land Commission, that he was in favour of free sale, but he qualified this statement by saying afterwards that the landlord should be allowed a veto on the incoming tenant.

Finally, the question remains, whether, if tenant-right is to be extended to the Southern and Western provinces of Ireland, it is to be a gratuitous concession from the landowner to the tenant, or whether the latter is to be called upon to pay a sum down, in the nature of a fine, of so many years' purchase of the rent, such calculation to be the limit for the future of the sum recoverable from the landlord, in the event of his wishing to resume possession of the holding. Lord Lyndhurst, in his article in the *Nineteenth Century* for October, 1880, on the 'Portsmouth Custom,' omits to state whether the tenant-right was freely granted, or whether it was purchased by the grantee. I shall not further allude to his article than to call attention to his tacit admission (p. 674) that the improvements are not as satisfactory as if they had been made by the landlord, and also to the fact that a right of veto is reserved by the landlord.

The obvious advantage to an absentee landlord of having a large and certain income free from deductions for improvements is plainly stated, and it is not unnatural to surmise also that it is to the palpable benefit of the Portsmouth estate in England.

It should be remembered that, by Section 2 of the Land Act, when a tenant of a holding outside the province of Ulster can prove the existence of tenant-right, he is entitled to the same advantages as if he lived in Ulster. It would be well if, instead of registering this tenant-right in the Landed Estates Court, tenants could be called upon to do so before the Chairman of Quarter Sessions, at a much smaller expense. Registration of improvements also, under Section 6, whether by landlord or tenant, should be carried out before the same authority: this would probably encourage both parties to register more freely than they do at present. It must be apparent that the bias of my remarks is opposed to the establishment of tenant-right where it does not already exist, but I hope that it will not appear to be from any selfish feeling as an Irish landlord, but purely from the injury that I believe tenant-right will cause both to the inherent virtues of the soil, and to the progress of agriculture. Lord Palmerston said once, 'Tenant-right is landlord wrong;' I believe it would be more accurate to say, 'Tenant-right is land wrong;' and I look forward with dismay to the further separation it will cause between landlord and tenant, severing the former from all interest in the development and improvement of his property, converting him into a mere rent-charger, and being a distinct incentive to absenteeism on his part.

I now come to the third subject of consideration—namely, the conversion of the present occupiers into freeholders, through the

medium of what are popularly called the Bright Clauses of the Land Act; and, looking to the vast body of evidence that has been adduced proving the content, love of order, and respect for the law, shown by small proprietors of France and Belgium, I do not think that I am too sanguine if I look forward to a similar result following upon a gradual extension and development of these clauses. I am fully aware of one strong objection, viz., that the first idea of many of the smaller occupiers would be to sublet or subdivide their holdings, and I acknowledge that, if no check for this could be devised, it would be a most serious objection, and a great evil. The penalty for this (since amended) proposed in the 44th Section of the Land Act, as it stood, was excessive and impossible to carry out.

I propose, instead, that when any occupier under these clauses expresses a wish to sublet or subdivide, or is detected in so doing, before the expiration of his rent-charge, he should be called upon to pay up in a lump sum the whole of the unpaid balance of the rent-charge, according to the scale alluded to in Section 51 of the Land Act. I believe this would deter most from wishing to proceed further, and it is probable that at the expiration of the term of the rent-charge, the then owner would see the advantage of keeping his holding intact and undivided.

One other advantage, too, in the interest of the due cultivation of the land, may be expected, and that is, that when left to their own resources, the idle, ignorant, and unthrifty will be eliminated, and give place to a more capable, more solvent, and more law-abiding class. I hope, too, that all classes of occupiers will avail themselves of the benefits of these clauses as opportunity offers; for, though excessively large holdings are a mistake, yet surely something more is required than that a man should only be able to produce from his holding sufficient for the bare necessities of life; he should be able to afford himself some small luxuries, and have the means, if need be, for advancing his children in the battle of life. I look forward, in fact, to the gradual formation of a class of 'yeomen' proprietors. Some slight difficulties must arise, which are little more than matters of detail, such as the purchase by occupiers who at present hold in 'rundale'—this would have to be considered, but I do not believe the difficulty to be insurmountable.

It has been objected that, under these clauses, the Executive takes the place of the landlord, and that as a matter of course it will be impossible to collect the rent-charge in hard times. I cannot see that there would be any greater difficulty than in collecting quit rent or any other fixed charge on the land. If, with the extension of the Bright Clauses, the reform affecting the laws of settlement, &c., and which is shortly expressed by the term 'Free land,' is carried, it will be found that there are many proprietors, particularly absentees, who would, if times improve, be ready and anxious to sell, and who

would care but little to whom they sold so long as they got a fair price.

Some writers, and among them Mr. Barry O'Brien, in his *Parliamentary History of the Land Laws*, claim that the occupier should have the right of pre-emption in the event of a sale. I think this will hardly hold good in the face of the proposal that land should be as freely sold as a personal chattel, and in the case of 'individual' proprietors I fail to see why they should be obliged to deal with only one class of purchaser, on such terms as the latter may think fit to offer. In the case, however, of 'Corporations,' where no hardship would be inflicted on individuals, I think they might be called upon to sell, and, as was done with the Church property, the first offer should be made to the occupying tenants. I would also suggest that the whole of the purchase-money should be advanced to the occupying tenants under these clauses, in the event of their being in a position to purchase the fee-simple of their holdings; so long as the price given was not excessive, the advance would be amply secured as a first charge on the land. The reason for this suggestion is that in a great many instances (among others, I believe, on the Glebe lands, near Newry, visited by Mr. Shaw-Lefevre) the purchasing tenants have heavily mortgaged their properties to raise the proportion of the purchase-money they were required to pay down.

It may be asked, very fairly, whence the funds are to come, when the sum authorised (1,000,000*l.*) under the 54th Section of the Land Act is expended. Mr. Fawcett has fairly enough objected to experiments in Irish land legislation being carried out at the expense of England and Scotland. I think, as suggested by Mr. Vernon, that amply sufficient means could be provided by calling upon the Church Commissioners to raise money, under Sections 59 to 64 of the Church Act, on the unexpended balance of the Church property; if, however, this proved insufficient, it might be supplemented by calling upon the Loan Fund Boards to realise their investments, and transfer them to the general fund. I believe the result of this would be of greater permanent benefit to the people than the work done hitherto by the Boards, meritorious and beneficial as it has been.

Mr. Shaw-Lefevre has pointed out, in his pamphlet on the working of the Bright Clauses, that the chief cause of their partial failure is the absence of any Commission to act as link between vendors and purchasers, as was provided for in the sale of the property of the Church. If such a Commission be appointed, I trust it may consist of the Commissioners and staff employed under the Irish Church Act; their experience would be invaluable in carrying out the details of this measure.

I may make one more suggestion, which I believe to be not altogether foreign to the land question—viz., that some means should be

devised, and assistance given, towards permanently providing houses and glebes for the ministers of religion of all denominations. I hope and believe it would be largely taken advantage of by the parish priest in the South and the Presbyterian minister in the North.

In conclusion, I would appeal to the Liberal party, to which I have the honour to belong, and especially to the press, to put the *just* construction on the motives and actions of Irish landlords. On many estates for generations the welfare of the tenantry has been the object of years of patient care and work on the part of the resident landlords, striving against difficulties altogether unknown in England. When not long ago a prominent member of the Government resigned his office, and paused in his political career, surely it was hardly decent for the first time, then, to bring forward an unsupported accusation of tyranny and oppression in the management of his estates.

The whole question is so momentous in itself, and the interests at stake are so great, that any policy of expediency would be intolerable. The Government, in their endeavours to frame a permanent settlement of the question, irrespective of passion, prejudice, and religious rancour, are entitled to the fullest support from all parties; and at the same time every sympathy is due to the Executive, on whom falls the burden of carrying out the onerous and stern task of repressing disorder.

DE VESCI.

THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE.

THE Council of Judges appointed by the Judicature Act has, under the powers given to it by the 32nd section of that Act, recommended the consolidation of the three Common Law Divisions of the High Court into a single division, to be called the Queen's Bench Division, and the abolition of the offices of Lord Chief Justice of the Common Pleas and Lord Chief Baron of the Exchequer. Their report to this effect will be laid upon the table of each House of Parliament, and will acquire the force of law unless one of the Houses addresses Her Majesty against its adoption within thirty days.

The decision of the judges was not unanimous, and the discussion was conducted in private, but the matter is one which deeply affects the public interests, not so much in its immediate effects as because it forms part of a large and important subject—the organisation of the High Court of Justice. Upon this subject I desire to offer some remarks for public consideration, as I greatly fear that the proposed changes, though not of the first importance in themselves, will form part of a set of changes by which the dignity and efficiency of the Bench will be greatly impaired, and by which the administration of justice will be deprived of some of its most characteristic and most deservedly popular features.

It is, I think, much to be regretted that the powers contained in the 32nd section of the Judicature Act were ever conferred upon the Council of Judges at all. The effect of that provision is to enable the Council to make the recommendations which they have made, but it does not enable them to make any report or recommendation on cognate subjects. The result is that they were compelled either to be silent or to recommend two isolated changes, the effect of which can hardly be estimated unless a full statement is given of the scheme of which they are to form a part. It is impossible to give a satisfactory opinion upon a part of a building unless you have a plan of the whole, and can so judge of the general effect of the matters on which you are to advise. In the same way I think that whatever changes are required in the constitution of the High Court should be made by a statute which can be discussed as a whole in

Parliament, and by the public, and not upon a report of judges to whom are submitted two specific propositions, which may be advantageous or otherwise, according to the other arrangements which may be connected with them. The practical effect of the resolutions passed by the judges will be that the changes recommended will be made without any proper public discussion of their nature and effect, and that when they have been made they will be taken as the foundation for other changes, which they will be said to involve in principle.

Upon these grounds I wished the Council of Judges to abstain from the expression of any opinion at all upon the subject, and to leave to the Executive Government the responsibility, which I think properly rests upon them, of making by statute such alterations in the present state of things as they consider necessary.

The alterations themselves, if they are to stand alone, and if it is to be understood that no further alteration is proposed, at least at present, in the constitution of the High Court, do not seem to me to be of the first importance. It is difficult to say precisely what would be the effect of fusing the three Common Law Divisions into one. For reasons which I will state more fully immediately, I do not think that such a fusion would make any great difference in the actual transaction of business. The same, or nearly the same, number of divisional courts (as they are called) would have to sit as at present, and it is by no means clear to me that it would in practice be found easier to make the detailed arrangements necessary for the transaction of business between fifteen men all consulting together than between three sets of five men, each set consulting by themselves.

With regard to the abolition of the two offices, more, no doubt, is to be said, though I think the question is one which interests the public much more than the judges. The promotion of a Puisne Judge to the position of a Chief Justice or Chief Baron has happened (I think) only once in the course of the last fifty years—namely, when Sir William Erle was made Lord Chief Justice of the Common Pleas. In every other instance these offices have been conferred upon Law Officers of the Crown who had proved in Parliament their possession of the various qualities which procure parliamentary success. The question of their abolition is accordingly one in which the existing judges have practically no interest, except so far as they are specially interested in whatever concerns the efficiency and dignity of their office.

The argument upon the subject appears to me to stand thus: In favour of abolishing the offices it is urged that, if the Common Pleas and Exchequer Divisions are abolished, there will be nothing for the Chief Justice and Chief Baron to preside over, and that their names will thus become anomalous, and, indeed, unmeaning. It is added, that their duties being the same as those of the Puisne Judges,

it is improper to give them a higher salary, superior titles, and the advantage of considerable patronage. Some persons go so far as to say that it is a positive advantage to break with the old associations which the names suggest, and to destroy the very semblance of continuity between the old courts and the new one. Finally, to the argument that the abolition of the offices would prevent the Law Officers from accepting judgeships, and so injure the relations between the Bench and the Bar, and diminish the authority of the Bench, it is replied, first, that such persons do not make good judges, and, secondly, that, though they would not accept *puisne* judgeships, they would accept the appointments of Lords of Appeal and Lords Justices.

To these arguments the following answers are given. It is admitted that the abolition of the Common Pleas and Exchequer Divisions of the High Court would leave no divisions for the Chief Justice and Chief Baron to preside over, but it is said that a title may remain as a title after the circumstances in which it originated have altered. If a great officer of the State can, without offence, be called Chancellor of the Exchequer, though he is not a Chancellor in any common sense of the word, and though no such place or office as the Exchequer exists, why should not an eminent judge be called Lord Chief Baron of the Exchequer, though there is no longer any Court of Exchequer, and though no more Barons are to be appointed? It is proposed to keep up the offices of Lord Chief Justice of England and Master of the Rolls, though the first is only a title, and the second little more. Why is the existence of four such offices any greater anomaly than the existence of two? The real question is whether it is expedient that either two or four of the judges should be paid more highly than the rest, both in money and rank. The argument that this is expedient is that otherwise Attorneys-General and Solicitors-General, and other barristers who have the prospect of holding such a position, will not accept judicial office; and as to their alleged willingness to accept the place of Lords of Appeal and Lords Justices, the answer is that the difference between the position of a Lord Justice and a *Puisne* Judge (which consists merely in the payment of the circuit expenses of the former, and in his being a Privy Councillor) would hardly be sufficient to induce men receiving already a higher salary, probably more than doubled by private practice, to accept the place; and that though the position of a Lord of Appeal is undoubtedly more attractive, it is not the one in which the public interests require men of this class to be placed. This last argument is of great importance, and unless it is fully understood it is difficult to appreciate either the importance of the offices proposed to be abolished, or the far more important question of the relation between the Court of Appeal and the High Court of Justice. It is based upon the principle that the business of a Judge of First Instance is of more importance than the business of a Judge of Appeal, and that it is highly desirable for

the due administration of justice that the most highly paid and highest in rank amongst the judges should be Judges of First Instance.

As to the comparative importance of the business of Judges of Appeal and Judges of First Instance, the following points are to be observed.^o In the first place, a large majority of the trials of any importance which take place in this country, and practically all trials in which the public take much interest, are trials by jury, or rather by a judge and jury. This is true without exception in regard to criminal trials, and true in a great majority of cases not criminal. In regard to these cases, all that a Court of Appeal ever has to do is to decide upon questions of law arising out of the trial, and the utmost stretch to which their power can go is directing a new trial. The rights of the parties to an action, the fate of a man accused of a crime, depend in all cases upon the verdict of the jury, and this is influenced to a great extent by the summing up of the judge, and by his management of the trial. Perhaps not one case in fifty presents any difficulty in point of law.¹ In all common cases the decision of the jury, under the direction of the judge, is not only final, but is unquestioned.

In the second place, trial by jury is the really popular and impressive part of the administration of justice.² It is understood by everybody. Everybody is interested in it. It is from such trials that every one, except a very small number of lawyers, derives his conception of the administration of justice and the character of the law. No one can ever have witnessed such a proceeding without being impressed by it, nor is any part of our institutions more characteristic. It is surrounded with ceremonies which I must confess do not appear to me to be in any degree inappropriate to the occasion, or liable to the charge of exaggerating its essential solemnity. If properly conducted, it may convey an impression of fairness, of dignity, and moderation calculated to give all who are present at it lessons not easily to be forgotten in many virtues. If improperly conducted, it may bring the most solemn institutions into contempt; but the tone and

¹ I have tried hundreds of criminal cases, and I have reserved only one (R. v. Bishop, a case on the construction of the Act relating to Lunatic Asylums) for the Court for Crown Cases Reserved. The trial of that case took nearly two days. The point of law arising out of it was decided without the least hesitation, in less than half an hour, and was reserved not because it was really doubtful, but because the Commissioners in Lunacy wished to have the correctness of a certain interpretation of words on the Act put upon the highest accessible authority. In civil cases the proportion of cases in which new trials are moved for is larger, but it is very small.

² In an interesting book just published (*The Life of Sir Rowland Hill*, i. p. 135) there is an account by Sir Rowland himself of the impression made on him in boyhood by a trial at Shrewsbury. 'Of all that passed before our eyes, or occupied our thoughts, during this ever-to-be-remembered visit, incomparably the most striking and impressive scene was a criminal trial.' He recollected the facts minutely, and described the whole scene picturesquely many years afterwards, when writing his recollections in his old age.

general character of the proceedings depend to a great extent upon the judge. Hardly any one who does not pass his life in courts can know how constant are the demands made, not only or chiefly on his knowledge of law, or on his readiness in understanding intricate facts and their bearings on each other, but on his temper, his good manners, his self-control, and his knowledge of mankind, and, in particular, on his sympathy with the feelings of those who appear before him, either as counsel, witnesses, or parties.

It must also be remembered that there is much truth in the saying that a judge is an advocate who chooses his side. In summing up in a case in which strong feeling has been excited, and the ablest men at the Bar have been engaged on the one side and the other, powers are required of the judge which a man of great learning and with great capacity for understanding legal principles does not always possess, and he must also have an understanding of, and sympathy with, popular feeling which the habit of regarding everything from the purely legal point of view not unfrequently weakens.

No one doubts the importance of the duties of a Court of Appeal. Its functions have a strong resemblance to legislation, and in the present day there is not the smallest reason to fear that they will be undervalued; but the qualities which I have been trying to describe are not required in the transaction of its business. The business itself is, as a rule, hardly intelligible to the public in general. The work is exclusively intellectual; there is nothing about it which appeals to the feelings, and hardly anything which even tries the temper. There are no witnesses, no jury, no prisoner, and the counsel have nothing to do but to convince the judges. The proposal to retain for the judicial Bench the services of the most distinguished members of the Bar by improving the position of the judges of the Court of Appeal is like trying to encourage surgery by holding out inducements to the best surgeons in London to accept positions in which they would only lecture and never operate.

On the other hand, the qualities required in a Judge of First Instance are just the qualities which a man who rises to the very first places at the Bar must possess to a greater or less extent. Such a man must be in Parliament. He must have seen a great deal of the world. He must be known not merely to the legal profession, but to the public at large. He is sure to be a good and effective, and he is likely to be an eloquent, speaker. He is also sure to have had occasion to look at law and the administration of justice (which is not quite the same thing) from the political point of view, and to have had occasion to acquaint himself practically with the feelings and sympathies of popular bodies.

Under the proposed new arrangements, the men who presumably possess these qualifications will either remain at the Bar or become

Judges of Appeal. This proceeds upon the supposition that to try a man for high treason or murder, or for a seditious conspiracy, or to try a case of libel which may involve the character and prospects in life of an eminent public man, are duties which the most distinguished men at the Bar cannot be expected to undertake, their eminence being such that they ought to devote themselves exclusively to the decision of points of law; such, for instance, as the question whether the owner of one of two adjoining houses can acquire by lapse of time a right to throw an unusual degree of pressure upon his neighbour's wall without his neighbour's knowledge. This seems to me a mistake. I think that, if it is worth while to make law-officers, and men who look forward to holding such offices, judges at all, they ought to be put to the sort of judicial work for which they are presumably best fitted—namely, presiding over trials by jury; but I see no special good in inducing them to become Judges of Appeal by special pay and special rank. They will discharge such duties no better than men who are rather lawyers than advocates. Whether it is or is not worth while to retain the services of the most eminent advocates as Judges of First Instance, is a point on which every one can form his own opinion by reading the list of Chief Justices, Masters of the Rolls, and Chief Barons for the last fifty years given in the note, and asking himself how many of them would have accepted puisne judgeships, and how far the public interests would have been advanced by their being made Judges of Appeal.³

The substitution of four Puisne Judges for the four chiefs—for, as I have pointed out, it is impossible to justify the existence of the offices of the Lord Chief Justice of England and the Master of the Rolls on any grounds which do not apply equally to the two offices proposed to be abolished—would not only deprive the bench of a class of judges specially valuable, but would also make a great change in the relation between the Bench and the Bar—a matter in which the public have a greater interest than they may know. Till now a seat on the Bench has been the highest object of a barrister's ambition. Law Officers have indeed often refused puisne judgeships, but no instance occurs to me in which one of the chief justiceships has been refused. The result of the proposed change would be to alter this, and to call into existence a class of parliamentary barristers who will have no desire to be judges and little sympathy with the Bench; and this would not only deprive the Bench of its most eminent members,

³ *Lord Chief Justices of the Queen's Bench:* Lord Denman, Lord Campbell, Sir A. Cockburn, Lord Coleridge.

Masters of the Rolls: Lord Langdale, Lord Romilly, Sir G. Jessel.

Lord Chief Justices of the Common Pleas: Sir N. Tindal, Lord Truro, Sir J. Jervis, Sir A. Cockburn, Sir W. Erle, Sir W. Bovill, Lord Coleridge.

Lord Chief Barons: Lord Abinger, Sir F. Pollock, Sir F. Kelly.

but would go far to lower it in the estimation both of the Bar and of the public. I do not think that anything has contributed so much to give the Bench the specific character which distinguishes it, and which I suppose the public would wish to be maintained, as the fact that it is not (as is the case in many other countries) a branch of the executive government, but an independent body forming the head of and closely connected with the most active and prominent of the liberal professions. If it should cease to occupy that position, it would cease to be regarded with anything like the respect or confidence which is accorded to it at present. That confidence rests mainly on the fact that it is composed of men who have won their position by success in a strenuous and protracted competition, in the course of which they have formed connections and associations with the great body of their countrymen in their political, personal, and commercial affairs rather than with government officials. If the Bench is to continue to be filled by men of the stamp of the present judges, it seems questionable whether it is wise to abolish those seats upon it which attract to it the very class of persons whose presence it is most important to secure.

I do not, however, consider the retention of the two offices in question as the most important point at issue. The true dignity of a judge's position depends ultimately neither on his rank nor on his salary, but on the importance of the duties which he has to discharge. I object to it principally because I have every reason to think that the abolition of these two offices is merely a step in a process which I regard as extremely mischievous, and as likely to diminish the dignity of the Bench by diminishing the importance of the duties allotted to the judges.

Some explanation is necessary to make this plain. The present organisation of the Supreme Court of Judicature, the Court of Appeal, and the High Court, with its five divisions, can be defended by no one. It is a mixture of two different and really discordant systems, not to say three.⁴ It is intolerably obscure and intricate, and its constitution has been one main cause of an increase of expense and delay in litigation which are bitterly and justly complained of. My belief is that these results have been caused by an ill-judged attempt to carry what is described as the fusion of law and equity further than it ought to be carried, an attempt founded on a neglect of distinctions which exist in the subject-matter of litigation. I think that the changes now proposed to be made will be found to constitute a long step in this direction, and that they will either produce an aggravation of the bad results already incurred, or destroy trial by jury in civil cases. In order to explain the connection between these

⁴ For the sake of simplicity I have omitted from this article all reference to the business of the Probate, Admiralty, and Divorce Division.

subjects, it is necessary to say something of the fusion of law and equity.

Before the Judicature Act the relation between law and equity might have been described in a summary way as follows:—

1. Law was administered by the Courts of Common Law according to one system of procedure, and equity by the Courts of Equity according to another system of procedure. The class of cases disposed of in equity was not altogether distinct from the class of cases disposed of at law, but in the great majority of instances there was a distinction between them, well recognised, though never well described.

2. Equity recognised and enforced a whole system of rights and obligations which were altogether unrecognised by the courts of law, and which they had no means of enforcing if they had recognised them.

3. Equity in certain cases provided remedies for wrongs which the law recognised as such, but for which it provided imperfect remedies. For instance, at law damages might be recovered for a breach of contract, but a decree for specific performance of it was to be had only in equity. In like manner equity in some cases helped people to enforce their legal rights, as, for instance, by compelling a defendant to answer a bill of discovery.

4. On the other hand, equity in particular cases had overruled and practically modified the law by forbidding people to exercise rights given to them by law, except upon conditions which the law did not impose. In the case of a legal mortgage, for instance, the mortgagee's interest at law was absolute as soon as the day fixed for payment had passed without payment, but the mortgagor's right to redeem was recognised and enforced by equity.

These were the four great points of difference or contrast between law and equity. The existence of such a contrast had for a great length of time been regarded as an evil, and its removal as an important reform in our legal system, and to effect this reform was one of the leading objects, not only of the Judicature Act, but of some of the provisions of the Common Law Procedure Acts of 1852 and 1854. That the object was excellent cannot be denied, but there are some qualifications upon the remark which I think were not sufficiently observed in passing the Judicature Act, and to which regard should be had in further legislation on the subject.

No doubt the distinction between law and equity cannot be justified upon any rational theory of law, though it can be explained historically. But it is equally true that the distinction corresponds, to a very great extent, to differences inherent in the subject-matter of litigation, and that the same may be said of the different modes of procedure appropriate to different classes of cases. The part of the

distinction which was mischievous has been effectually removed. Every right recognised either by law or by equity is now recognised equally in every branch of the Supreme Court of Judicature. The possibility of any conflict between law and equity is at an end, and every court has unlimited power to administer every remedy which could previously have been administered by either. To this extent accordingly a fusion has actually been effected between law and equity, and no one, I suppose, would doubt that this has been a great improvement.

This, however, is by no means^o all that the Judicature Act seems to have been intended to do. It took a long step in the direction of attempting to cause all cases to be disposed of by one court, and by one method of procedure, especially as regards the course of appeal and the mode of trial, and in this I think it questionable whether the Judicature Act did not go too far, and I feel sure that in the legislation which we must now expect, other principles neglected by it ought to be considered.

If the question were still an open one, I am disposed to think that it would have been better, instead of fusing eight courts into one, to be content with fusing the three Common Law Courts into a single court, perhaps under the name of the Court of Queen's Bench, and to have enabled the judges of all the superior courts to act for each other in case of need, and to exercise all the powers belonging to any of them in any case which might require it; but the Judicature Act was otherwise conceived, and must no doubt be taken as conclusive. It would however, I think, be unwise to try to carry simplification beyond the reduction of the number of the divisions from five to three, for experience shows that the distinction between the business of the Equity Division and the business of the three Common Law Divisions is very nearly as much founded upon a real distinction in the subject-matter of litigation as the distinction between the business of either of them and that of the Probate, Divorce, and Admiralty Division.

It is not easy to give an unprofessional person a clear notion of the distinction between the business which goes to the Chancery Division and that which goes to the Common Law Divisions, but I do not think any one who is accustomed to the practice of the courts will fail to recognise the existence of such a distinction, though it is difficult to give a perfectly satisfactory theoretical account of it. For practical purposes, however, a few general observations will be sufficient.

Nearly all the litigation in the Common Law Divisions and a great part of the litigation in the Chancery Division arises out of contracts and wrongs. But, from the nature of things, such actions fall into two classes, which are clearly distinguishable from each other.

The first class consists of actions in which two people or two sets of people are interested, and in which well-marked questions of fact or law or both are raised, and in which the remedy sought is the payment of damages. These actions are disposed of in the Common Law Divisions, almost always by a judge and jury.

In the other class of actions more intricate questions arise both as to the parties and the remedies, and the judgments given have to be interpreted and enforced by a machinery which the Common Law Divisions neither possess nor require. These actions are disposed of in the Chancery Division.

I think, too, that the questions of fact which arise in cases in the Chancery Division differ from the questions of fact which arise in the Common Law Divisions. In the latter the question commonly is which of two sets of witnesses is telling the truth? and in such cases it is essential to see and hear the witnesses, to watch their demeanour, and to have them examined and cross-examined *vivâ voce*. In equity cases it constantly happens that, though formal proof of facts has to be given, and though different views of admitted facts have to be presented, there is no sharp, definite contradiction at all. Evidence in such cases can be given far more conveniently and cheaply on affidavit than by word of mouth.

A classification of the litigation arising out of contracts and wrongs into that which admits of simple remedies and that which requires intricate and qualified remedies, and again into that in which two persons or sets of persons are interested and that in which more than two persons or sets of persons are interested, may appear to be unscientific and almost trifling; but it is extremely convenient, and it answers closely to the distinction between cases tried by a judge and jury and cases tried by a judge alone, and it must be remembered that the distribution of business between court and court, or between different divisions of the same court, is not a matter of science, but a matter of mere convenience and division of labour. A distinction which would form a very bad foundation for a treatise may form a very good foundation for the convenience of suitors and the despatch of business. If a man were writing a book on the human body, he would arrange his work with a view to the general plan of the body as he understood it, and not with reference to the remedies which particular diseases or injuries might require; but the medical profession divides itself into branches having relation not to the structure of the body but to the treatment of disease. Medical men are either physicians or surgeons, though all deal with the same subject-matter. It is not a mere fancy to say that a criminal trial or an action for damages has a resemblance to a surgical operation, and a decree in equity to a course of medical advice.

To a considerable extent, however, the subject-matter with which

law and equity are conversant differ at least as much as the subject matter with which either is conversant differs from that of the Divorce, Probate, and Admiralty Division. The principal subject with which Courts of Equity are concerned is the interpretation and administration of trusts, which are the creation of the Courts of Equity, and form, I believe, a legal conception peculiar to English law. Whether, if the whole law were codified, this conception would be retained, and how in that case it would be expressed, I do not say; but, taking matters as they stand, it is, I think, obvious that to attempt to fuse the law relating to trusts with any other branch of law would be absurd. The thing could not be done, and an attempt to do it would produce, not simplicity, but confusion and obscurity. It would make the law hopelessly unintelligible.

There is another matter closely connected with this which will always make it necessary to keep Law and Equity to some extent distinct from each other. The establishment of the system of trust estates, and of the distinction between legal and equitable interests (which is far too firmly fixed in our national habits to be removed), has been one of the principal causes which have imposed upon the Courts of Equity a vast mass of business utterly unlike any which is transacted by the Courts of Common Law. I refer, of course, to administration suits, suits in which vast masses of property are administered under the orders and by the officers (either permanent or appointed for the purpose) of the court. The effect of this is that the Chancery Division has to superintend the management of an enormous mass of property, and the transaction of every imaginable kind of business connected with it, at every step in which it may be necessary to take the directions of the court as to the course to be pursued with reference to the interests, it may be, of a great variety of persons. Obviously this is a matter by itself, requiring special experience and a special organisation, and not capable of being fused with any other branch of the administration of justice.

For all these reasons I think that the fusion of law and equity has gone as far as legislation can for the present carry it. I also think that the distinctions already referred to must involve corresponding distinctions in the procedure of the two divisions, but I do not propose on this occasion to discuss any part of this question except that which relates to the course of appeal in the Chancery and Common Law Divisions.

The method of procedure favoured by the Judicature Act, and which it is now, I apprehend, proposed to extend, is sometimes described as 'the one judge system,' and its essential feature is that every cause, whether legal or equitable, should be tried in the first instance by a single judge, to whom it should be allotted from its commencement, and who should preside over it throughout, till he delivers a final

judgment, and that this judgment should be subject to an appeal to a court of three judges. The original intention was that the decision of the Court of Appeal should be final, and it was proposed to abolish the appellate jurisdiction of the House of Lords; but this idea was given up, and the decision of the Court of Appeal is itself liable to a final appeal to the House of Lords. I do not think it is proposed to alter this part of the system, and I have no remark to make upon it.

This one judge system existed in the Courts of Chancery for many years before the Judicature Act, though it was more common for two than for three judges to sit in the Chancery Court of Appeal. Since the Judicature Act, it has prevailed in the fullest way in the Chancery Division, and it is no doubt intended to extend it to the three Common Law Divisions.

With respect to this proposal, I have the following propositions to establish:—

1. It cannot be carried out fully without abolishing trial by jury in civil cases.

2. Any attempt to carry it out fully, without the abolition of trial by jury, will greatly lower the efficiency and the dignity of the Puisne Judges of the Common Law Divisions.

3. The imperfect attempts hitherto made to introduce it have caused great intricacy, delay, and expense in the administration of justice.

4. A scheme may be suggested which would obtain all the objects in view without being open to any of these objections, and without involving any expense to the public whatever, or any change in the business of the Chancery Division, and which would greatly diminish the expense of litigation.

1. First, then, I say, that the full introduction of what is called the one judge system is inconsistent with the maintenance of trial by jury in civil cases. It is surprising to me that this obvious fact should require to be stated, and should apparently have been generally overlooked. It is, however, self-evident. The essence of the one judge system is, that the case is first tried by a single judge, who decides both the fact and the law, and then retried by three judges, who also decide both on the fact and the law. The appeal, in fact, is a rehearing.

On the other hand, the essence of trial by jury is, that the jury find the facts under the direction of the judge who tries the case, and that the judges, to whom the appeal lies, do not enter upon the question of fact for the purpose of deciding it, but only for the purpose of considering the correctness of the direction given to the jury by the judge who tries the case, in order to decide whether the matter of fact shall be remitted to another jury. In two

words, where there is no jury an appeal is a re-trial. Where there is a jury, a motion for a new trial is the only form of appeal consistent with the essence of the institution. Therefore, so long as trial by jury in civil cases exists, there must be a distinction between the course of appeal in cases tried before a jury and cases tried without a jury.

Short and simple as this proposition is, I believe it to be entirely overlooked by those who wish to introduce the one judge system into the Common Law Divisions, unless indeed their object is to get rid of trial by jury by a side wind.

2. My second proposition is that any attempt to carry out fully the one judge system without abolishing trial by jury in civil cases, will greatly lower the efficiency and the dignity of the Puisne Judges of the Common Law Divisions.

This proposition follows from the last, for the result of such an attempt must necessarily be as follows: there would be in the Common Law Divisions a division between the Court of Appeal and the Court of First Instance similar to that which now exists in the Chancery Division. The duty of the Puisne Judges would be confined to trying causes at *Nisi Prius*. If it was considered that they had misdirected the jury, or that the jury had given a verdict against the evidence, or that a new trial should be had on any other ground, an appeal would lie to a Court of Appeal of three judges, who, if they thought fit, would direct a new trial. It is obvious that the effect of this would be to make the Common Law Judges mere commissioners for the trial of causes at *Nisi Prius*, and to deprive them of all connection with the decision of matters of law. That this would greatly lower the dignity of the judges is obvious. It would practically make them mere reporters to the Court of Appeal of facts ascertained by the help of a jury, and would afford an irresistible temptation to them to be indifferent to questions of law, which they would leave entirely to the Court of Appeal. The Judges of First Instance would thus cease, to a great extent, to require any special knowledge of law, though they would be appointed from a body of men distinguished rather as lawyers than as advocates. The Judges of Appeal, on the other hand, would have no special occasion to inquire into facts, though they would be appointed not so much on account of their knowledge as lawyers as on account of their eminence as advocates. The square men would be put in the round holes, and the round men in the square holes.

The same result would be produced upon the efficiency of the Bench. It is a thoroughly well-established rule, resting upon obvious convenience, that a motion for a new trial should, if possible, be made before the judge who tried the case. He knows as no other judge can know what that evidence was and what were his reasons for directing

the jury as he did. If the judge who tried the case is to be a mere commissioner to take evidence, and is never to sit upon a motion for a new trial, the court which hears such motions will be deprived of the advantage of his presence and knowledge of the case, whilst his sense of responsibility for the decision would be greatly impaired, as he will hear no more of the matter after the verdict has been given.

I know it will be said that under the Appellate Jurisdiction Act, 1876, a Judge of First Instance is not only empowered, but required, as far as possible to decide the whole of every case which comes before him, determining questions of fact by the aid of a jury, and reserving for further consideration questions of law which cannot be conveniently decided at the trial. No doubt the Act contains a provision to that effect, but in practice it can be acted upon only in the few cases which involve no substantial dispute of fact, and the reason is obvious to any one who is familiar with trials by jury. The questions of law which usually arise upon such a trial are almost always questions as to how the judge ought to direct the jury, or whether certain evidence should be admitted or rejected. Such questions must be decided at once, and cannot be properly argued before they are decided. It would cause an intolerable waste of time and money to interpolate elaborate legal arguments into trials before a jury. The judge must decide there and then whether he will admit evidence or reject it, and whether he will direct the jury in accordance with this or that view of the law. This obvious consideration seems to me to have been left completely out of sight by the Appellate Jurisdiction Act of 1876.

The result of all this is that the practical effect of trying to apply the so-called one judge system to trials by jury must be to subordinate the Judges of the Common Law Divisions entirely to the Court of Appeal, and to make them, as I have said, mere commissioners to take evidence. I have already given my reasons for thinking that to do this would be one of the greatest misfortunes that could befall the administration of justice in this country. It would subordinate the more important function of trying causes to the less important function of deciding points of law on appeal. It would assign to men holding a position attained principally by legal knowledge functions requiring a combination of a great variety of far rarer and more important qualities, and it would assign to persons presumably possessed of those qualifications the duty of hearing appeals upon points of law. It would, in other words, be based upon the absurd theory that the ablest advocates at the Bar are the greatest lawyers, and that the best lawyers are likely to make the best judges for the trial of causes. It is as if men were made professors of medicine, and restrained from practice on account of their skill in practice, whilst others were put in charge of hospitals because they had written

books displaying much knowledge of the theory of their profession.

Such an arrangement would, in my opinion, injure the Court of Appeal quite as much as the Courts of First Instance. Appellate jurisdiction can hardly be exercised as it ought to be, unless the judges are also Judges of First Instance whose knowledge of the actual administration of the law is kept up by constant practice. Under the present constitution of the Court of Appeal, its judges possess this advantage, inasmuch as the Presidents of Divisions, who are members of it, constantly sit as Judges of the Court of First Instance, whilst the Lords Justices (with one exception) all go circuit. An arrangement which tended in any way to put an end to this advantage would be as unwise as an arrangement which confined eminent physicians to the task of advising with other members of the profession in consultation, and excluded them from attendance by themselves upon sick people. If the two sets of duties were confined to separate courts, the Courts of First Instance would, to a considerable extent, lose the opportunity of considering and studying the general principles of law, and the Judges of the Appellate Court would lose that familiarity with the detailed application of general principles to current litigation which is essential not only to the proper apprehension, but to the complete and cautious statement of legal principles. The two duties are really component elements of one and the same function, and ought to be discharged by the same persons at different times. It must of course be remembered that I am now referring only to cases tried by juries. When the appeal is a complete rehearing, as is the case with appeals in the Chancery Division, the Judge of First Instance and the Judges of Appeal each perform in turn the whole of the same function in the same way, and in this case the Judge of First Instance differs from the Judges of Appeal merely in the fact that he is one and they are three.

Another consequence would follow from the scheme which I deprecate, of which it is a more delicate matter for a judge to write, though I do not like to pass it over. I refer to the effect which would be produced by dividing the judges into two grades, probably not very unequal in number, but distinguished from each other by a difference both in rank, and title, and in pay, just marked enough to be important, but not marked enough to answer the purpose which is now answered by the offices which will be abolished. As matters stand, I cannot say that it would for the first time introduce upon the Bench the principle of promotion, but it would give to this principle much greater force and prominence than it ever had before. Hitherto the general principle has been that a judge ought to have nothing either to hope or to fear from any quarter. He has nothing to fear, but he has something, though it may not be very much, to

hope for. I do not imagine that any one supposes that this circumstance has ever exercised, or that it is probable that it will ever exercise, any influence on the conduct of any judge on the Bench, but there are matters in which it is well to be jealous and suspicious, even though no actual danger may present itself, and this seems to me to be one of them. I think it ought not to be open to any one to say of a judge 'he wants to be promoted.' No one, of course, would wish to interfere with existing titles or allowances, but it would certainly be an advantage in any scheme that it gave the same title and same advantages to all judges who performed duties of the same degree of importance.

3. My third proposition is that the imperfect attempts hitherto made to introduce the one judge system have caused great intricacy, delay, and expense in the administration of justice.

That great intricacy, delay, and expense do exist in, and arise out of, the present constitution of the High Court, I suppose no one denies. It is enough, by way of example, to say that its intricacy is such that in one sense there is but one court—namely, the Supreme Court of Judicature; that in another sense there are three courts—namely, the Court of Appeal, the High Court, and the Supreme Court of Judicature; and that in yet another sense there are seven courts—namely, the Chancery Division, the three Common Law Divisions, the Probate, Divorce, and Admiralty Division, and the two Divisions of the Court of Appeal. Each judge of the Equity Division, indeed, may be reckoned as a court, and, if so, there are in all ten, or perhaps eleven, courts.

As regards expense and delay I suppose I may take it for granted that great dissatisfaction exists upon the subject, and I am not surprised at it, for, apart from the expensiveness of the system of pleading established under the Judicature Act, it is a fact, as certain as it is little known, that, in respect of Common Law actions, the liberty of appeal which existed before the Judicature Act has, for practical purposes, been doubled—I might in strictness say trebled—though there was no occasion to increase it at all. This has been due entirely to an omission on the part of the authors of the Judicature Act to recognise the obvious distinction which I have already pointed out between the nature of appeals in cases which are tried by a jury, and appeals in cases which are tried by a judge without a jury. This I will now proceed to show.

Down to the year 1854 the methods of reversing the decision of a jury were as follows: first, a writ of error, which was, practically, hardly ever applicable, as it applied only to errors apparent on the record; secondly, a bill of exceptions, which was seldom employed; and thirdly, a motion for a new trial, which last was the method commonly employed. A motion for a new trial was in substance,

though it was not in name, an appeal from one judge sitting at *Nisi Prius* to three judges sitting in *Banc*, and their decision was final. As the motion had to be made in the first four days of the first term after the trial, Common Law actions were speedily determined, and I do not know that any special complaint was made of their not being determined satisfactorily. By the Common Law Procedure Act of 1854 this state of things was altered, and in certain cases an appeal from the decision of the Court in *Banc* was allowed to the Court of Exchequer Chamber, and thence to the House of Lords; but practically such appeals were very seldom brought, because the Court of Exchequer Chamber was inconveniently large, and could hardly sit without shutting up the two courts of which it was composed; and also because the right to appeal was limited by conditions as to costs and by other restrictions, the effect of which was that the remedy was not worth having except in cases which seldom occurred. In a great mass of other business there was no appeal at all from the decision of a Court sitting in *Banc*. For instance, if the courts refused or granted a *habeas corpus* or other prerogative writ, or if they confirmed or dismissed an order made by a judge at chambers, no appeal lay from their decision. Matters stood thus till the Judicature Act came into force in 1875. It is thus true for practical purposes (though the statement is not perfectly correct), that till the Judicature Act came into force there was but one appeal in Common Law actions—to wit, an appeal by way of a motion for a new trial from the decision of the judge and jury at *Nisi Prius* to the Court sitting in *Banc*. In other words, there was an appeal from one judge to three judges. In short, the one judge system, as it is now called, did actually exist in regard to Common Law actions in fact, though not in name, down to the year 1875.

It was, as I have said, the object of the authors of the Judicature Act to apply the one judge system to the Courts of Common Law; they seem to have overlooked the circumstance that it already existed there, because they did not recognise the fact that a motion for a new trial was really an appeal from one judge to three, and they seem to have considered that uniformity could be produced, or at least that a step towards it would be made, by substituting the new Court of Appeal for the old Court of Exchequer Chamber, removing at the same time the conditions which restricted appeals to the Court of Exchequer Chamber to a very small number of cases. The Divisional Courts were accordingly substituted for the Common Law Courts sitting in *Banc*, and the Court of Appeal for the Exchequer Chamber, and an appeal was given in all, or nearly all, cases from the decision of the Divisional Courts to the Court of Appeal, and to the House of Lords. The result of this was practically to double, and in some cases to treble, the power of appealing in the Courts of Common Law. On

every motion for a new trial, without any exception or any condition so framed as to restrict appeals to matters of importance, two appeals may be made—namely, first an appeal to the Court of Appeal, and next an appeal to the House of Lords. The same power was given in the case of an appeal from a judge's order at chambers, so that if a judge orders, say, that the evidence of a witness in France shall be taken by commission, an appeal lies to the Divisional Court, to the Court of Appeal, and to the House of Lords, and so strangely are matters arranged, that, in the final result, two judges may overrule four; for the judge at chambers, two judges in a Divisional Court, and one judge in the Court of Appeal, may be overruled by the two other judges in the Court of Appeal.

Putting the matter shortly, the result of the attempt to extend the one judge system from the Courts of Equity to the Courts of Common Law has been to destroy it where it existed and gave full satisfaction, and to introduce in its place a system certainly not more efficient, far more dilatory, and probably costing the suitors one-third more than the old one. These results have been caused entirely, as far as I can judge, by misunderstanding the nature of appeals in cases tried by juries, and by trying to apply to such cases a course of appeal suitable for cases tried by a judge alone.

Until this principle is fully recognised and acted upon, it will be found practically impossible to organise the Court in a satisfactory manner. It has been supposed that this might be effected by abolishing the Divisional Courts, and the Appellate Jurisdiction Act of 1876 appears to be based on this view, for it directs that as far as possible single judges shall dispose of all causes, and that Divisional Courts shall be composed of two judges and no more, except in special cases, when they may be composed of three judges. The Act shows little practical acquaintance with Divisional Courts and their proceedings, and those who suppose that it can be carried out so as to economise judicial strength show that they have not mastered the subject. If the Divisional Courts are to be discontinued, and if the Common Law Judges are to do no business which cannot properly be done by judges sitting alone, it will be necessary to increase largely the number of Judges of the Court of Appeal. The following account of the business of the courts may not be quite complete, but it is complete enough for practical purposes. It distinguishes business which can properly be done by single judges from business which requires the presence of more judges than one.

1. All criminal business, except hearing cases in the Court for Crown Cases Reserved, can be done by single judges. The Court for Crown Cases Reserved sits only three or four days in the year, and may be left out of account.

2. The trial of actions at *Nisi Prius* can be done by single judges,

and in cases where there is no jury, a single judge can carry the case through to final judgment.

3. Interlocutory orders in civil cases can be made by one judge, and I may observe in passing, that a few simple reforms relieving the judges of duties which ought not to be cast upon them, and especially of what are called judgment debtor summonses, would be equivalent to adding another judge to the Bench.

4. There are a few proceedings raising issues of mere law which a single judge could no doubt decide with propriety, such as demurrers and special cases. There may be some other matters of the same kind, but they do not occur to me. I may observe that such cases are very uncommon. I have never yet had to hear a demurrer argued. Special cases are commoner, but they are not common.

These, I think, are all, or nearly all, the duties which can properly be assigned to a single judge. The following, which form the principal part of the work of the Divisional Courts, clearly ought not to be discharged by less than two judges.

1. Motions for new trials. Such motions are commonly made either on the ground of misdirection, or on the ground that the verdict was against the weight of evidence, though there are other grounds which occur less frequently. If such a motion is made on the ground of misdirection, and if it is made before a single judge, it is in effect an appeal from one judge to another of equal authority, and this is obviously wrong. If, on the other hand, the motion is on the ground that the verdict was against the weight of evidence, it is an appeal to the judgment of one man on a matter of fact from the judgment of twelve men, and if the judge appealed to is the judge who heard the case, the appeal is either against his summing-up, in which case it is not likely to be successful, or in favour of his summing-up, in which case it is likely to be too successful. In all these cases, there ought clearly to be a plurality of judges. Sir Alexander Cockburn thought there ought to be three, and I am far from saying he was wrong.

2. Appeals from an order of a judge at chambers ought obviously not to be made to a single judge of equal authority.

3. Appeals from the inferior courts, and cases which go into what is called the Crown Paper, and, in particular, cases reserved by magistrates in the exercise of their summary jurisdiction, are all in the nature of appeals, and inasmuch as the principles involved in such decisions may be just as important as if their direct consequences were more serious than they are, I think that it would be unsatisfactory to the public if they were decided by a single judge. Several of the inferior courts, too, as the Lord Mayor's Court and the Court of Passage at Liverpool, have a jurisdiction of unlimited amount.

The business of the Divisional Courts is almost entirely made up of these matters—namely, motions for new trials, appeals from judges' orders at chambers, appeals from inferior courts, and other business which is, in fact, though not always in name, appellate business.

This jurisdiction represents the business of the old Common Law Courts sitting in Banc, and the result of the Judicature Acts has been to superimpose upon it, in the case of motions for new trials and appeals from chambers, a further appeal to the Court of Appeal. There is thus obviously one appeal too many in these cases.

The business to which I have referred occupies three courts of two judges each during the whole, or for the greater part, of the four sittings which correspond to the old terms.

Though an appeal does lie, as I have already said, to the Court of Appeal, appeals are actually brought only in a minority of the cases disposed of, one Appellate Court of three judges being sufficient to hear them. If, therefore, the Divisional Courts are discontinued, and all the appellate business is transferred to the Court of Appeal, its members would have to be largely increased—indeed, I doubt whether less than two additional divisions of the Court of Appeal could get through the additional business. In other words, six of the present Puisne Judges would have to be made Lords Justices.

There is one kind of business transacted in the Divisional Courts which is of the very highest importance, and which is not appellate business, and ought, I think, to be decided on the first hearing without appeal. I refer to applications for prerogative writs, and especially for the writ of Habeas Corpus. The occasions on which such a writ is demanded are commonly of great importance, and it is surely the best course in such cases to go at once, whenever it is possible, to the court by which the matter is to be finally decided. The name is not very important; but if a court of three judges is to decide on such a question (summary proceedings or routine cases before a Judge at Chambers stand on a different footing), it ought to be brought before them at once and not by way of appeal.

The result of the whole is that, if the Divisional Courts are to be abolished, it will be necessary to enlarge the numbers of the Appellate Court to such an extent that the Puisne Judges would form the exception. Surely this in itself would be a considerable evil. If most of the judges were members of the Court of Appeal, the position of the comparatively small number who were not would be greatly lowered, but they would still have to discharge what are intrinsically the most important of all judicial duties.

So far I have been engaged in pointing out the defects of the existing constitution of the court and of the alterations proposed in it. I now pass to my fourth and last proposition—which is that a scheme may be suggested which would obtain all the objects

in view without being open to any of these objections, and without involving expense to the public, or any change in the business of the Chancery Division, and which would greatly diminish the expense of litigation. The plan is an extremely simple one. First, I would do away with the intricate phraseology which calls one court by many names, and enact that, for the future, there should be one court only—namely, the High Court, which for the distribution of business should be divided into three divisions, the Chancery Division, the Queen's Bench Division, and the Probate, Admiralty, and Divorce Divisions. I would also provide that the Chief Justice of England should be President of the Queen's Bench Division, and the other chiefs, if retained, be Vice-Presidents of it. The Lord Chancellor (who is President of the Chancery Division, though he never, or hardly ever, acts as such), the Master of the Rolls, the President of the Divorce Division, I would leave as they are. Subject to these exceptions, and subject to existing distinctions of rank, title, and pay, I would have all the judges called by the same title, receive the same pay, and take precedence according to their seniority. In the place of the Court of Appeal I would have appellate benches, consisting either of three or of two judges, according to the nature of the business to be disposed of. Appeals from hearings in the Chancery Division should be, as at present, to a bench of three judges. Motions for new trials in the Queen's Bench Division might be heard by benches of three judges; appeals from inferior courts or in interlocutory matters might be heard by benches of two judges, whose decision, or failure to decide owing to a difference of opinion, should be final, unless they gave leave to appeal, in which case there should be an appeal to a bench of three judges, whose decision should be final. The Lord Chancellor, the Master of the Rolls, and the three Chief Justices should decide from time to time how many appellate benches of three or two judges should sit, and how many courts should sit at Nisi Prius. The judges of each division should decide amongst themselves by a rota who should sit on appellate benches and who at Nisi Prius. It might, I think, be understood that the bench taking Equity appeals should have, if possible, one Common Law member, and that a certain number of members of the Chancery Division should sit on the Appellate Bench for cases from the Queen's Bench Division. The Chancery Division would have to consist of eight members, to correspond to the Master of the Rolls, three of the Lords Justices, the three Vice-Chancellors, and Mr. Justice Fry; and the Common Law Division of eighteen members, corresponding with the other three Lords Justices, and the fifteen members of the three Common Law Divisions. Of course, the existing Lords Justices would be called upon to sit only on Appellate Benches, so that the change I propose would come into force gradually as vacancies occurred amongst

the Lords Justices. I think it would be very desirable to provide that (circuits notwithstanding) four judges should sit continuously in the Chancery Division for the trial of causes, for when the three Vice-Chancellors who now sit vacate their offices, their successors will be bound to go circuit, and I have a strong impression that the public will be ill satisfied if the business in the Chancery Division is interrupted, and I have great doubts whether they will be well satisfied if the judges of the Common Law Divisions have to take their turn in trying equity cases. Such a course appears to me to imply a pedantic determination to overlook the convenience of arrangements for the division of labour which have been established by practice, in favour of an ill-founded expectation of giving the law a degree of simplicity which does not belong to it.

This plan, it will be observed, maintains the existing number of judges, but simplifies the constitution of the court, making the division between appeals and trials the foundation of the distribution of business between different benches of the same court, instead of being, as it is at present, a ground for a most intricate division of the court itself.

The judges of the court so constituted would stand upon an equality, except so far as the existing chief, the Master of the Rolls, constituted an exception, and thus promotion on the Bench would be practically at an end. The court would no longer be organised on the false supposition that appeals are necessarily or as a rule more important than trials. Each of the judges would take his part in the trial of causes and in the hearing of appeals, and each would thus be made familiar, not only with all matters of legal principle decided on appeal, but with the detailed application of those principles to actual litigation. The maintenance of the ancient offices of the Lord Chief Justice of the Common Pleas and the Lord Chief Baron of the Exchequer would be consistent with the scheme, and for the reasons already given I think this would be desirable; but it is not an essential part of it. If it were thought best, upon the whole, to abolish these offices, the only modification which the scheme would require would be the appointment in their place of two additional Puisne Judges in the Queen's Bench Division.

The scheme would cost nothing. It would ultimately save a little if, as the offices of the Lords Justices became vacant, they were filled by judges whose circuit expenses were not paid. I do not, however, think that the question of saving that small amount is one to which the public would attach much importance. My own feeling is that the dignity of a judge's office depends upon the importance of his duties, on the manner in which they are discharged, and on his independence of the executive and even of the legislative branches of the government. On the question of titles and money I have only to say

that I think it would be well if ultimately all the judges, with the exceptions I have explained and tried to justify, were to stand on the same footing.

The great practical importance of the adoption of my proposal would be that it would reduce the number of appeals and bring the procedure of the Chancery Division and the Queen's Bench Division as nearly into conformity in that particular as is possible, regard being had to the difference between trials by a judge alone and trials by a judge and jury. The scheme would leave the course of appeal in the Chancery Division just as it is.

Several persons to whom I have mentioned this scheme have asserted that it is a proposal to reinstate the old Court of Exchequer Chamber. The fact is that it is just the reverse. It is a proposal to reinstate the old Courts in Banc, and to do away with the unnecessary intervention of the Court of Exchequer Chamber, which has become permanent and active under the Judicature Act, instead of being hardly ever used, as was the case under the old system.

This change would greatly diminish the number of appeals and the cost of litigation, and it would in particular bring the appeals on interlocutory proceedings into a reasonable compass. This is a matter in which the public, and even the greater part of the profession, are much in the dark, and it was not fully considered in the Judicature Act. Before that Act passed, appeals from orders in chambers lay by way of motion to the Court in Banc, and could be carried no further; and as the power of the masters of the court to make interlocutory orders is of very recent date, the result was that upon no order at chambers, however important it might be, was there more than one appeal. The Judicature Act gave three appeals in respect of orders made by judges, and four appeals in respect of orders made by masters, however trifling the order might be.

It is very difficult for any one, except a judge accustomed to sit in chambers, to form an adequate notion of the nature of the business transacted there. It has a great deal to do both with the efficiency of the court and with the expense of litigation. About one-half of the work, or something between one-half and two-thirds, ought not, in my opinion, to be put upon the judges at all. I refer to the judgment debtor summonses, which I think might well be disposed of in other ways. The remaining half is of all imaginable degrees of importance. A large proportion of it represents the desire of quarrelsome people to keep each other at arm's length, and put each other to expense and trouble, and the desire of fraudulent people to put off as long as possible the evil day when they will be compelled to pay their debt or make amends for their wrongs. In such matters as these a single appeal is quite enough, but cases do occasionally come before judges at chambers which may turn upon

principles of the greatest importance, and practically involve the decision of actions in which character, or property, or personal liberty are at stake. These are, of course, an essential part of the business of the court, and in such cases I think the court appealed to would seldom refuse leave to appeal further in cases in which a further appeal was really required.

Such is my view of the changes which the constitution of the High Court requires. I hope they may be thought worthy of consideration before practically irrevocable steps are taken which would greatly alter, and as I think for the worse, perhaps the most popular and one of the soundest of all English institutions.

JAMES FITZJAMES STEPHEN.

A GLIMPSE AT NEWFOUNDLAND.

ONE fine August day a friend of mine and I, being anxious to explore the hunting-grounds of Newfoundland, embarked on board an Allan steamship, and after a somewhat boisterous passage, found ourselves deposited in the city of St. John's.

St. John's, the capital of Newfoundland, is remarkably well situated on the northern side of a magnificent harbour. The entrance to the harbour is through a very narrow passage between lofty, precipitous, rugged cliffs; but within, the haven expands and forms a perfectly secure, land-locked, and commodious shelter from the wild waves that lash those inhospitable shores. The most noticeable point about the city is that all the manufacturing energy of the population appears to be concentrated in the making of long fisherman's boots, and the keeping of public-houses. It produces seal oil and cod-fish, and consumes rum and tobacco. St. John's is a busy, thriving, money-making place, and the prosperity of the capital of the oldest colony of Great Britain is appreciated by the traveller long before he sets foot upon her classic shores; for one side of the harbour smells abominably of dried cod-fish, and the other of seal oil. Judging by the accent, there must be a large mixture of Irish blood in the population, a conjecture which is not confuted by the fact that the inhabitants of St. John's and of the outports—as all the other towns and settlements are called—and of the island in general, are a splendid set of tall, strong, active, healthy-looking men. Accustomed from childhood to brave the hardships of a most rigorous climate, drawing their sustenance from the teeming but treacherous bosom of a storm-vexed ocean, that rages in vain for ever round a rugged reef-bound coast; navigating their frail and ill-found schooners amid tempest, ice, and fog, the Newfoundlanders have developed into one of the finest sea-faring populations on the face of the globe. Nowhere can better mariners be found than among the hardy, adventurous, self-reliant men who ply their precarious calling along the dangerous shores of their native island, or on the wintry coast of the neighbouring mainland of Labrador.

The principal industry of Newfoundland is the cod-fishery, and the chief centre of the trade is at St. John's, where the process of

packing and shipping the salted fish may be witnessed to perfection. The fish, having been dried on stages erected for the purpose on the shores of every bay and inlet of the island, are brought to St. John's in small schooners and thrown in heaps upon the wharves of the merchants. There they are culled over, sorted into three or four piles according to their quality by experienced cullers, who separate the good from the indifferent, and the indifferent from the bad, with great rapidity and unerring skill. Women with hand-barrows attend upon the cullers, carry the fish into an adjoining shed, and upset their loads beside barrels standing ready to receive them. A couple of boys throw the fish into a cask, piling them up a foot or so above the brim, mount on the top, and having danced a war-dance upon them in their hob-nailed boots to pack them down, roll the barrel under a screw-press, where two men stand ready to take charge of it. Grasping the ends of the long arms of the lever, the men run quickly round a couple of times, lift their feet off the ground, and, throwing their weight on the lever to add impetus to the blow, swing round with it, and bring down the stamp with a dull thud, compressing the cod-fish into a compact mass. The cask is then rolled out from under the press, and handed over to two coopers. In a trice the hoops are driven on, the cask is headed up, and then trundled down an incline into the hold of some vessel, loading for the West Indies or some Mediterranean port. The rapidity with which the whole process is managed is remarkable.

Sealing operations also are vigorously conducted by the inhabitants of St. John's. In former days the seal fishery was carried on in sailing vessels, and was attended with considerable danger; but now that steam-ships are used the risk is much diminished. The paying nature of the business may be gathered from the fact that steamers of five or six hundred tons burden, built and fitted for the purpose, and quite useless for any other trade, make a large profit in average years, although the sealing season lasts only a month or six weeks. Early in the spring, about the beginning of March, the ice from the north strikes in towards the eastern coast of Newfoundland, bringing with it hundreds and hundreds of thousands of seals, young and old. Then St. John's wakes up, and the whole island is in a bustle. Though it entails constant exposure to great cold, and extremely hard work, the young men struggle eagerly to secure a berth for the sealing season, for they earn very high wages, and the business is salted with that element of uncertainty and danger which adds such a relish to life. At length everything is ready, and a fleet of steamers from St. John's, and of sailing craft, of all kinds and sizes from large coasting schooners down to open boats, issuing from every bay, start out to look for the ice. The ships, crowded with as many men as they can hold, make two trips of about a fortnight's duration each; the first being devoted to the capture of the young seals, at that

time only a few weeks old, and the second to the destruction of the full-grown animals. The latter are generally shot, while the former are knocked on the head with clubs. As soon as the ice is reached, the men scatter themselves about the field, running over the rough surface, jumping from block to block of loose ice, tumbling into holes and scrambling out again, wild with excitement in their search for seals. Each man acts independently, doing the best he can for himself. When he has killed a seal he stops but a minute to whip off the skin with the blubber attached, and fasten a cord to it, and then off again after another seal, till he has got as many as he can drag, when he returns, towing his load behind him, to the ship. The men work with a will, giving themselves scarcely time to eat or rest, for they receive a share of the profits according to the number of seals that each man brings in, and if the season is successful, an active and daring man will make a large sum of money. The seals are valuable only for the oil which is tried out of their fat, and which is employed for various lubricating purposes, and for their skins, which are tanned and used principally, I believe, for shoe leather. They do not produce the pelt which, when plucked and dyed, is worked up into those lovely seal-skin jackets that are as destructive to the purse as they are delightful to the eye. The number of seals brought in annually is very great, as many as 500,000 having been killed in a single season, and the business employs nearly 10,000 men. What becomes of the multitude of surviving seals is a problem I have never heard satisfactorily solved. The ice, on which they come down in swarms every year from the north, melts during the summer months soon after coming in contact with the warm waters of the Gulf Stream. What then becomes of the seals? Do they find their way back through thousands of watery miles to their polar birthplace, or do they remain scattered about along the shores of Newfoundland and the neighbouring continent? It is a problem in natural history similar to the eel puzzle at home, for we are still in ignorance as to what becomes of the millions of full-grown eels that descend our rivers with each autumn flood, but which are never seen reascending the stream.

We remained some days in the interesting city of St. John's, much enjoying the kind hospitality of our friends, but waiting somewhat anxiously for an opportunity to get a lift down the coast to the neighbourhood of our proposed hunting-grounds. The regular fortnightly steamer did not call in anywhere near our destination, and day after day passed without any coasting vessel sailing in that direction. From this dilemma we were relieved by the kindness of a judge who was about to start on his circuit in one of the harbour tugs, and who very good-naturedly undertook to put us ashore at the mouth of the river we wished to ascend. This offer was most thankfully accepted, and shortly after, my friend and I,

with three Mic Mac Indians from Bay of Despair, two birch bark canoes, one month's provisions and a very limited supply of baggage, steamed out of the picturesque harbour of St. John's in the august society of the judge and all the functionaries of his court. The whole court was there assembled, including judge, barristers, lawyers, clerks, and all—everybody, in fact, except the criminals and the jurymen; and it really was a pity they could not have been provided also; it would have saved such a lot of time and trouble. As far as I could see, there was very little work for the court to do. We would stop occasionally, apparently at any nice likely-looking spot for a malefactor, and send on shore to see if there was any demand for our commodity, namely, justice. Generally we were informed that the inhabitants did not require any just at present, but that perhaps if we would call again another time a little later, we might be more fortunate; and then we would give three hideous steam whistles by way of a parting benediction, and plough our way through the yielding billows to some other settlement, where, if we were lucky, the court would divest itself of oil-skin coats and sou'-westers, and go ashore to dispose of the case or cases to be tried.

We were a very jolly party, and amused ourselves by lounging about the little deck enjoying the fresh air and grand wild coast scenery, reading 'dime novels' and playing cards in the stifling saloon below, where we were veritably 'cribbed, cabined, and confined'—stuffed as close as herrings in a cask. There was something rather comical in the whole proceeding. To my insular and antiquated notions, a judge is an awful form clad in a solemn wig and wrapped in gorgeous robes and the majesty of the law, and barristers and the whole *personnel* of a court of justice are superhuman creatures, extraordinary 'mortals to be looked upon with wonder not unmixed with awe; and to see eminent counsel staggering about the slippery deck in long boots and guernsey frocks, and the highest functionary of the law playing profane games of cards in his shirt sleeves, condescending to exchange remarks concerning the weather with grimy stokers and tarry-breeched seamen, and even experiencing inner qualms and spasms when our little ship tossed and struggled across some wide exposed bay, quite destroyed my illusions, and produced a feeling of somewhat irreverent amusement. The mere fact of the judge going his circuit in a tug-steamer appeared strange and incongruous, though why he should not go in a steamer just as naturally as in a train or a coach-and-four,—I do not know. Indeed, it was the natural mode of progression in Newfoundland, where the ocean 'is, or was at the time of my visit, the principal highway. Roads in those days—and I am thinking of events which happened some years ago—there were none, except in the vicinity of St. John's and one or two other towns. People who, for their sins, had to go from one part of the island to another, travelled in the

most uncertain, vague, and promiscuous manner, sometimes taking days, weeks, or even months, in accomplishing quite a short distance, and sometimes never getting to their destination at all. The usual method of procedure appeared to be to embark in the coasting steamer, and go ashore as near the place you wished to visit as the route pursued by the steamer would permit. The traveller might by that means get within ten or twenty or fifty or one hundred miles of his destination, as the case might be. He would then betake himself to a house or cabin, if there happened to be one in the neighbourhood, and wait there, or he would build a big fire and sit on a rock until some coasting schooner, or fishing smack, or open boat happened to pass by, going in the right direction, in which he would embark and get another lift upon his road. By such means he would eventually accomplish his object if he was lucky; but if, unluckily, no craft going the right way came by, he would be compelled to take a passage in some vessel or boat bound in exactly the opposite direction to that in which he wished to move. I remember we called in at some place or other—I forget the name—on our way back to St. John's, after our hunting expedition, and a clergyman came on board begging for a passage. 'I understand,' he said, 'that you are bound round the north end of the island to Halifax. It is rather out of my way to go there, it is true, for my destination is a few miles south of this; but I have been waiting here till I am sick and tired of it, for a chance of a lift down the coast, and I shall be truly obliged to you if you will take me to Halifax, where I can get the fortnightly Allan steamer to St. John's, which will be better, at any rate, than waiting here indefinitely.' We replied that we were bound for St. John's and not for Halifax, as he had supposed, and that we should be delighted to take him on board. 'Oh,' he cried joyfully, 'that is charming, it will suit me much better of course to go straight to St. John's. I have been wandering about for weeks and weeks trying to get to my parish, which is not far from here. I was staying in St. John's on a visit to some friends, when I received a message saying that one of my parishioners was dead and required to be buried. As the necessities of the case were pressing, I took my passage in the coasting steamer that left the following morning, and ought to have arrived at my destination the same night. Unfortunately, however, a strong off-shore breeze sprang up, and the steamer being unable to call in carried me some distance up the coast to the next stopping place. Then I was delayed some days till I got a lift in a fishing schooner, but she was driven by stress of weather into some little harbour where no steamers called, and eventually went off in a direction that did not suit me at all. The same bad luck has pursued me all along, and I have been wandering about ever since, taking every opportunity offered me by passing coasting craft or fishing boats; sometimes being carried miles away, sometimes getting pretty

near, but never succeeding in actually reaching my journey's end. As the season is getting late and winter will soon be upon us, I made up my mind to abandon the attempt for the present, and go round with you to Halifax, if you would take me, and so back to St. John's to finish my visit; for as it is now a couple of months or so since my services were required to bury the gentleman, it is probable that my presence is no longer necessary on that account.' We were much more astonished than was our guest, at the extraordinary delays and troubles to which he had been subjected, but after becoming a little better acquainted with Newfoundland, we perceived that there was nothing so very unusual in his misfortunes after all, and that similar experiences were looked upon with a calm and philosophical spirit by the natives.

It was late in the afternoon of a beautiful, still, warm autumn day that the 'Hercules' dropped her anchor in the Bay, and after putting us safely ashore with our Indians, canoes, and baggage, and after three hearty cheers and three hideous ear-splitting screams from the whistle, steamed away out to sea again and left us to our own devices. There was quite a settlement in those parts, consisting of a small saw-mill and house adjoining inhabited by the white man who ran the mill, and of two or three families of Indians, all rejoicing in the name of Joe. The head of the tribe was old Abraham Joe, a fine specimen of his race, an active upright man, standing about six feet two inches in his moccasins, and broad and strong in proportion. He had spent nearly all his life in Newfoundland, and knew the interior of the island better than any man living. He was a good hunter, trapper, and guide, but he was—well, he is dead, and I will put it mildly—he had the bump of acquisitiveness highly developed. They had, I should imagine, a very pleasant life, these Indians; and if one can judge by the independence of the men, and the nature and quality of the clothing worn by the girls, they must have been very well off in this world's goods. They had comfortable little cabins, in which they spent the winter in comparative idleness, earning little or nothing. The single exception to this rule was in the case of one of old Abraham Joe's sons, who carried the mail during the winter and spring months between St. John's and the copper mines at the entrance of the Bay. He was well paid, and deservedly so, for his was an arduous task. Travelling on snow-shoes backwards and forwards over a distance of some hundreds of long, weary, desolate, monotonous miles, over bare wind-swept barrens, through dense pine forests and thick alder swamps, without a mark to guide or a hut to shelter the traveller; tramping on alone with no companion to cheer one on the lonely way, without the chance even of seeing a human being from one end of the journey to the other; struggling along from dawn to dark of the short wintry days against snow, storm, or sleet, or in the bitter cold of hard frosty weather; crouching through

the long nights by a solitary fire with a few bushes stuck in the snow for shelter; caught perhaps in some sudden thaw, when the softened snow clogs and sticks in the netting of the snow-shoes, and progress is almost impossible; exposed to *mal de raquette*, snow blindness, and all the chances of a forest life—such an occupation is one that fully deserves to be well paid. However, the activity of this particular ‘Joe’ was abnormal; the rest of the family spent their winters lounging about the beach, making perhaps a few mast hoops, butter tubs, or fish barrels, or sitting by the stove indoors, smoking their pipes and doing nothing. In the summer they fished a little, and in the autumn the whole community went up Indian brook and spent two months in the interior of the island, shooting and trapping beavers and otters. Fur was pretty plentiful in those days, and a man could make a good income out of a couple of months’ hard work, furring in the fall. These ‘Joes’ appeared to entertain, to a limited extent, communistic principles, while partially recognising at the same time the right of private ownership in land and chattels. They would use each other’s boats, canoes, &c. without hesitation, but spoke of them nevertheless as belonging to some individual member of the sept. They wandered about the island in an apparently haphazard, aimless, happy-go-lucky way, and some member or other of the family was always turning up at odd times in unexpected places. Sometimes we would meet a Joe striding over some barren or crossing a lake in his canoe; occasionally a Joe would drop into our camp, miles away from anywhere, unprovided with boat, canoe, provisions or baggage of any kind, and furnished only with a pipe, tobacco, a rusty gun, and some powder and lead. He would sit down quietly by the fire and chat a little and smoke a little, and after a while accept, with apparent *insouciance*, an invitation to eat and drink, and after consuming enough food for three men and swallowing a few quarts of tea, would say, ‘Well, I suppose I shall be going now. Adieu, gentlemen, adieu. Yes, I guess I was pretty hungry; most starved, I expect. How am I going to cross the lake? Oh, that’s all right; we—that’s old Peter John Joe’s son, and I—got a canoe a little way off; mebbe one, two, three, four miles; I’ll cross in her, I reckon. Expect likely I’ll see you again by-and-by—I shall be coming out again about the end of this moon.’ ‘Well, good bye,’ said we, ‘but where are you going to? not trapping, evidently, because you have got no traps.’ ‘Yes, I’m a going a trapping, that’s so. Not far—mebbe two or three days back in the woods—beaver pretty plenty there; left my traps there last fall—no, let me see, fall before last, I guess.’ ‘But what are you going to live on all the time?’ ‘Oh, I got plenty grub, no fear; not much tea, though’ (showing a little parcel of the fragrant herb knotted up in a corner of his dirty blanket), ‘and no sweetening; mebbe you could spare a little tea and sugar, eh? No! ah well, all the same, never mind, suppose my tea

give out, perhaps make some spruce tea. You see young John Joe, he got a *cache* yonder, away off just across that blue ridge, about one day or one day and a half, or mebbe two days' journey, plenty flour there; and young Peter John Joe and old John Peter Joe, they *cached* their cooking pots on the little stream there, near the north end of big blueberry pond. See you again soon. Adieu!' and after a few words in Mic Mac to our Indians, this particular Joe would walk off, to be seen no more till he reappeared after some time with half a canoe load of beaver skins, or perhaps to turn up quite unexpectedly in the course of a day or two, in company with some other Joe whom he had come across promiscuous-like in the woods. Over this small community and large territory old Abraham Joe ruled after the manner of a feudal lord, settling all little disputes and parcelling out the country into hunting grounds for each individual member of his family. Indians are very tenacious of their territorial rights: each man has his own hunting, or rather furring, ground accurately marked out with the marches carefully fixed, perhaps up one river from its mouth to its source, then across in a straight line through the woods to some other creek, and down that stream to such and such a lake, and so on; the boundaries are all arranged among themselves, and it is considered a most iniquitous proceeding for one trapper to trespass on the district belonging to another. Their system of land tenure is similar to that of most primitive peoples in tribal times. They consider that the land belongs in common to the clan, but each member has a certain part of it allotted to him for his temporary use, and he possesses a limited life-ownership over his own particular share. Poor old Abraham Joe was very unhappy about the state of things in Newfoundland. Too much civilisation was destroying the island, in his estimation. 'Yes, sir,' he said to me one day, 'things is very different from what they used to be. Lord! I mind the times when a man might travel from one end of the island to the other and never see nobody nowheres. Beavers were plenty then, and there was a good price for fur too; now there ain't no price, and beavers and otters ain't plenty like they used to be. Those d—— lumbermen be come up the rivers and scare the game. Why, there ain't a bay scarcely anywheres without one, mebbe even two *liviers*¹ in it. Yes, sir, it's true; Newfoundland he spoil, too much people come, too much people altogether in the country, no use furring any more, no price now for beaver skins, very bad times now, most impossible to make a living. Expect you don't want that axe-head, do you, sir? It would come in very handy. I lost mine the other day—head flew clean off the handle into the water. Can't do without it, can't you? Well, never mind; mebbe you won't want to take your canoes out of the country. I'd like to trade with you for one of them.' He became

¹ A 'livier' signifies a person who lives all the year round in a locality, in contradistinction to one who only visits it during the fishing season.

a positive nuisance, did the old man, about the axe-head, and followed us about for days on the chance of getting it for nothing, pleading awful poverty, at the same time that he refused an offer of four dollars a day to come with us for a short time hunting.

The sole representatives of the Joe tribe left at home on the evening of our arrival were an old woman and two girls of about eighteen or twenty, whose clear complexions and good features I must suppose were to be accounted for by some mysterious influence exercised by the superior over the inferior race, for I should be sorry to indulge for a moment even in speculation which might be derogatory to the conduct and character of former generations of Joes. On inquiry, we found that most of the family had gone off some days before to the copper mines, to solemnise the wedding of a couple of fond and youthful Joes, and were expected home that night. About midnight they returned; two large whale-boats full of them, rather noisy and very jovial. The unfortunate but loving Joes had not succeeded in getting married, as the priest, who was expected to arrive by the coasting steamer, had failed to put in an appearance; but nowise discouraged by this untoward event, the party had consumed the wedding breakfast, wisely deciding that the ceremony might keep, but the viands would not. The bride and bridegroom bore their disappointment with a philosophical composure to be found only among people who attach no value whatever to time. In answer to our condolence they replied, 'Oh, no matter; mebbe he come next steamer, mebbe in two, three months, mebbe not come till next year,' and dismissed the subject as though it were a matter of no importance whatever to them.

We tried hard to obtain the services of some able-bodied Joe, but they were all bent on going into the woods to hunt beaver on their own account, and nothing would induce any of the men to take service with us. We might have had our pick of the women, and we regretted afterwards that we had not engaged a couple of girls. They are just as well acquainted with the country as the men; they can paddle a canoe and do all that a man can, except carry loads, and are able to fulfil certain duties that a man cannot—for instance, they can cook, tan hides, and wash and mend clothes. We often regretted afterwards that we had gone into the country without a guide. The Joes would not give our Indians any accurate instructions, and although an Indian in St. John's had explained the route to me as well as he could, it is so difficult for a white man to understand an Indian's description of a country, that my ideas on the subject were very vague and hazy. An Indian thinks little of the points of the compass, and uses them very inaccurately. He seems to rely rather upon the prominent landmarks and principal features of the country to find his way about, and attempts to explain the route by reference to solitary pines, high hills, hard wood ridges, swamps, and streams.

In saying that a river runs south-west, he probably is taking it the reverse way, counting from the mouth to the source, and really means that it has a north-east course; and he invariably calls all the tributaries of a river by one and the same name: a fact which leads to infinite confusion. However, we determined to trust to luck to find our way to the hunting-grounds, and, after spending all the forenoon in patching up canoes and arranging the baggage in suitable-sized bundles, we made a start late in the afternoon, poled up to a picturesque fall some four miles from the mouth of the stream, made our 'portage' round it and camped for the night. It was a lovely evening, and we thoroughly enjoyed it as we lay on our comfortable beds of *sapin*, gazing, through the transparent walls of our tent, at the moonlight mingling with the flickering flames of the camp fire, listening to the whisper of the wind among the trees, and the distant drowsy varying music of the fall, smoking our pipes in placid contentment, delighted that at last we were fairly launched into the woods.

We got along very nicely for the next two days, though our progress was not rapid, but on the third day the brook became so shallow that we had great difficulty in advancing any farther. The channel was almost dry in places, and we had to wade all day, heaving stones out of the way, pushing and pulling our heavily laden canoes by hand, carefully manœuvring them among the rocks, and wriggling our way very slowly up the lessening stream. It was evident that we must be near the head of navigation, and my companion and I splashed on ahead in the bed of the stream to look out for the 'portage.' We walked and walked till we felt sure that we must have passed the 'carry,' and were on the point of turning back when I espied a swarthy countenance peering cautiously at us through an alder bush. 'Bojour!' said we, and 'Bojour!' answered old Abraham Joe, emerging from his covert. 'Where you going to?' 'Well,' we replied, 'we don't exactly know where we are going to, but we are looking for the "portage." Is it anywhere near here?' 'Yes,' said he, 'close handy, just a little ways up the stream. Water very low, ain't it? Plenty rain pretty soon, and then have good water in the brook. You going hunting, I guess? Not much good, deer all gone. You wait, by-and-by we get through hunting; mebbe one of my sons show you where to find plenty. Mebbe I go with you myself,' added the old man, with an air that seemed to say, 'There, just think of that: there's a chance you don't get every day of the week.' We camped that night on the portage, and the next day 'carried' over to a neighbouring lake in a drenching rain, and pitched our tent close to the camp of the patriarch and certain other members of the Joe family. The old man's prophecy of 'plenty rain come soon' was abundantly fulfilled during the next three days, for it rained and blew, and blew and rained, the whole time without ceasing. The

natives did not seem to mind it in the least, but lounged about in the wet as unconcernedly as if water was their natural element. I remember going over to old Joe's tent one morning for something or other, and finding a little French boy that he had with him lying outside by the dead sodden ashes of the fire, in a most uncomfortable attitude, leaning on his elbow with his head supported by his hand, drenched of course to the skin through his tattered clothing, and shivering with cold, but sleeping soundly all the same. 'Why, Joe,' I said, 'what a shame to keep that miserable little boy out in the cold and wet all night.' 'Oh,' he replied, 'he don't mind; he hard, hard all the same as one d—— dog: do him good.'

We remained a few days on the shores of the lake, but finding no sign of game, crossed to the opposite side, made a short 'portage' to another lake, traversed that, and after a long and toilsome tramp over land of some eight or ten miles, arrived at what we hoped would prove our final destination. What a lovely hunting country it was! Not more than half a mile from our camp, which was placed in a nicely sheltered little island of wood, rose a steep hill, which commanded an unobstructed view over miles of open country. Bare, dry, barren, the surface principally composed of rock covered with lichens on which the reindeer feed, alternating with patches of softer ground carpeted with the beautiful ivory white cariboo moss, shallow pools and trickling streams, sheltered depressions in the plain supporting a sparse growth of junipers and dwarf pines, combined to form a perfect paradise for game. But, alas! it turned out to be an empty Eden. Day after day we wore out our moccasins tramping over the stony ground, seeking for a sign but finding none; day after day we climbed the look-out hill and vainly swept the plain with our glasses. That game had once been abundant was very evident, for the plain was crossed in all directions by paths worn deep into the surface by the countless feet of constantly passing herds of cariboo, but now rapidly filling up through long disuse. Patches of sun-dried clay showed footprints that had been made long before our arrival; the tattered bark and broken branches of many a pine-tree showed where a great stag had rubbed his horns, but the scars were all old and brown; numerous horns lay scattered about in evidence of how plentiful the deer must have been at one time, but they were bleached by the sun, weather-worn and half-consumed. It was plain enough that deer had once frequented those plains in great numbers, but it was equally certain that not a deer had visited them for months. The great barrens on which we were hunting—if a man can be said to be hunting when there is nothing to hunt—stretch nearly right across the island from east to west, and occupy all the country from north to south between Grand Pond, a magnificent lake of some eighty miles in length, and Red Indian Pond. The extent of hunting country is very large; and, thinking

that surely there must be some herds of deer out on the barrens somewhere, we made expeditions from the main camp of a day or two's journey, and thoroughly searched the country in all directions. It was in vain; not a fresh track did we find. We proved that there was not a herd of cariboo within twenty miles or more of us, and, after spending a fortnight of our valuable time in a most unprofitable manner, we packed up our goods, and with weary and dispirited steps returned to our canoes, made the best of our way back to Joe's camp, and after resting a day, started in the teeth of a fierce gale for Grand Pond.

Our course led us through a splendid game country. We camped at nights in the very passages through which, in former days, the cariboo used to pass in countless numbers during their annual autumn migration from the north to the south side of the island, but we were a day too late for the fair. Lumber-men were cutting timber on the shores of Deer Pond and rafting it down the broad current of the Humber; white men had invaded those solitudes, and the cariboo had abandoned them in disgust. We made a nice camp at the north end of Grand Pond at the mouth of a little stream from which a faint trail, blazed some ten or perhaps twenty years before by a wandering Indian, led up through the pine woods to the open barren above, and there we stayed for a week, during which time we saw three hinds and killed one of them. The flesh was welcome, for we had been living all the time on beaver meat; but what we wanted was one or two of the gigantic heads for which the Newfoundland stags are so famous; and as it did not appear likely that we should be successful in that district, we packed up for the third time, paddled some ten or twelve miles down the lake, lugged our tent, bedding, and cooking things up a steep hill side, and camped just on the edge of the barren, about a thousand feet above the lake, determined to make one more attempt. The next morning my friend, accompanied by one of our Indians, started in one direction, while young John Joe—who had joined us for a few days—and I tried our luck in another.

It was a lovely morning as we cleared the woods and emerged upon the open breezy barren. The sky was cloudless: we could see for miles round to the south of us and across the lake to the north, but the surface of the water was hidden by a veil—not of mist, but of thick solid-looking cloud. The effect was curious, for the whole valley of the lake was filled with a bank of white motionless cloud, so level that it looked as if the water had been turned into milk. Suddenly, as the sun rose higher, this mass began to move—to roll about and lift a little in places—and then, almost instantaneously, it all broke up, curled off in wreaths, vanished in thin air, and disclosed the placid deep-blue surface of the water beneath. We had not walked far before we discovered three stags standing distinct against

the sky line on a distant ridge. The ground was so level and so bare of cover, that it was impossible to get near them unperceived, and I was obliged to content myself with a long shot. I fired both barrels, and, to my disgust, saw all three deer trot quietly off together. After a while they wheeled round and stood looking back to see what was the matter, and gave me a chance for another long shot, which seemed to satisfy their curiosity, for they turned at once and disappeared over a little rise. An expression more emphatic than polite escaped my lips, I fear; but Joe only smiled, and said, 'How many deer went over the rise? Three, eh? I only see two now going up the other side: one stop down in the hollow; mebbe you hit him, or what he stop down there for?' 'By Jove, Joe, you are right,' cried I. 'Let's after him.' 'No, no; he all right—he safe enough; bound to get him by-and-by. Let's go after the other two. They won't go far, not much scared—no wind, you know—and not much afraid of the noise.' The stags in truth were not much alarmed, and moreover they were so fat, so preposterously fat, that they literally could scarcely run away; and after a very hard chase, keeping ourselves as much as possible out of sight, we got within range again and bagged another stag. While Joe was engaged upon the dead body of the deer, I noticed some object moving a long way off, and with the glass made out two men, one looking towards us, while the other was stooping and working at something on the ground. 'Hurrah, Joe!' said I, 'they have got the other one. Not a bad bag after all, to finish up an unsuccessful hunt. Luck has turned at last. Plenty of fresh meat for supper to-night, Joe.' 'Yes,' muttered Joe, with his bloody knife between his teeth, 'glad of it too. I have not tasted a bit of fresh meat this year: most tired of chewing beaver meat; you got two days more, eh? Well, we go out again to-morrow; leave the other men to fetch the meat in and mebbe get something more. Suppose you let me have the skins to make snow-shoes: must beat out for something to make snow-shoes this winter. No deer left in this country now.' So Joe worked away gralloching the deer, while I, having made a little smudge of dry lichens and moss to windward to keep off the swarms of black flies that pestered us, smoked my pipe, happy in the certainty that we should not suffer the disgrace of returning to St. John's quite empty-handed.

Scarcely had Joe and I got well away from the camp next morning, when such a blinding storm of rain came on that we were compelled to make a little shelter for ourselves among some dwarf junipers and wait till it was over. We lit a little fire, boiled some water in a pannikin, brewed some tea, and talked about hunting until the clouds lifted and enabled us to see our way about the country; but the best part of the day was gone, and we had to return to camp without seeing anything or even a fresh track. The day following we were obliged to set out on our homeward journey, for we had left

ourselves only just time enough to catch the tug steamer which was to call for us in the bay, even by travelling almost night and day; but as I was loth to quit the country without one more try, Joe and I climbed up to the barren before daylight, leaving the others to pack up, carry the baggage and meat down to the lake, and get everything ready for a start in the afternoon. Joe got the best of me that day to the extent of twenty-five dollars, the villain. We had walked for hours without seeing a thing, when he remarked in a casual manner, 'You have not seen no bears, have you, since you came in the island?' 'No, Joe,' I replied, 'not even a sign. I should have thought bears would have been plenty enough; there is lots of feed for them, goodness knows, for the whole barren is covered with blueberries; but they seem to be very scarce.' 'Yes,' answered Joe, 'bear's awful scarce in Newfoundland, but I think I know a place where we might find one, only I ain't got much time; want to get back to my beaver trapping, you know. What you give me if I show you a bear?' 'Oh, well,' I said, 'I don't know; there is no chance of that now; but I would give a five-pound note for a shot at a bear if we had time to look for one.' 'All right,' said Joe; 'suppose I show you a bear within shot, you give me five pounds, eh?' 'Yes, Joe, certainly I will,' replied I. 'That's sure, eh?' 'Yes.' 'Well, look yonder.' And following the direction of Joe's extended hand, I saw a little black speck moving about near the summit of a neighbouring mountain. 'Oh, I say, Joe, that is rather too bad,' I remonstrated. 'I could have seen him just as well as you, and got up to him too, for that matter. However, a bargain is a bargain, so let us go for him.' The ground was very bare and open, but Bruin (or 'Mouin,' as the Indians call him) was so busily engaged eating blueberries, that he allowed us to crawl up pretty near. I had to wait some time for a shot, for the bear would not stand still for a second, but kept turning himself about restlessly, moving rapidly from bush to bush, grumbling to himself the while—complaining, no doubt, about the scarcity of berries that autumn and the difficulty of filling his ravenous inside. At last I got a good opportunity, but made a bad shot, striking the animal too low down on the shoulder, and only breaking his leg. With a violent snort of pain and astonishment, but without looking round for a second to see what was the matter, away went 'Mouin' down the mountain side at a most surprising pace. 'Come on,' yelled Joe. 'Try and head him off; if he once gets down into the timber he is gone sure.' And away we went after him as hard as we could tear. How Joe jumped and bounded and yelled, and how the bear did put out down that hill side! He seemed to go twice as fast on three legs as any other animal ever went on four. Sometimes Joe would head the bear and turn him, sometimes the bear would make a drive at Joe and turn him, which would give me time to get up; and so we went on yelling and whooping and

plunging through the tangled matted junipers, the bear doubling and twisting, and sometimes charging us, but always struggling gallantly to gain the shelter of the woods. We had the best of Bruin as long as we were on the bare ground near the top, but when we got among the junipers growing horizontally like creepers along the ground, not rising more than three or four feet above the surface, but with stems as thick as your leg, and interlacing branches as hard and springy as steel, then the bear got so much the best of us, that we feared we should lose him. Now and then I would get a shot, but shooting under such circumstances is chance work, and I missed the bear several times, until at last with a lucky shot I rolled him over, and Joe and I threw ourselves down exhausted beside his dead body. Joe's first action was to be violently sea-sick; he then sat him down on a rock, filled and lit his pipe, and gasped out, 'Oh, I thought we should have taken off our breeches!' I stared at Joe, thinking his exertions had produced a fit of temporary insanity, and said, 'Why, Joe, what on earth should we take off our breeches for?' 'What for?—Why, suppose you not got any breeches on, you run heap faster. Best always take 'em off before shooting at a bear: he run such a devil of a pace if you only wound him.' And so, having rested a little and skinned our bear, and packed the hide and some meat on our backs, we scrambled down to the shore, chucked our burdens into the canoes lying ready laden, and paddled off under the light of a rising moon.

Our canoes were deep in the water. A straight course led us far from shore, and once or twice my heart leaped into my throat with a horrid feeling of apprehension, at the sudden unearthly scream of a startled loon, sounding exactly like a human shriek of agony denoting the capsize of one of the following canoes; but no such untoward accident occurred, and after some hours of paddling we drew up our boats at our old camp near the head of the lake, made a fire, cooked and ate our supper, and after a couple of hours' sleep started again the following morning, about two hours before dawn. We had hard work on that day's journey. The river was very rapid: our course lay up stream, and we had to pole all the way. It is not easy for a novice to stand upright in a small birch-bark canoe, but after a little practice he gets his canoe legs, and learns not only to balance himself without danger to the frail craft, but to exert in safety the whole of his strength in forcing her up some rapid stream. It is astonishing to see the apparent ease with which two good men will drive a canoe up a rapid. They approach it in the same way as does a fish, stealing quietly up, husbanding their strength, and taking advantage of every little eddy to get as close to the fall as possible; and then make a rush out into the stream without any hurry, plashing, or confusion, but with quiet, methodical, concentrated strength. Once out in the full force of the current, and the struggle begins. For a

few yards the momentum of the canoe carries her on ; then she stops, the men throw their whole weight upon their poles, that bend beneath them and tremble in the glancing stream ; the water hisses by the side, and curls up in front of the prow as the canoe is forced up inch by inch against the tide. Hold on now in the stern, while the bowman takes a fresh hold. Down slips the canoe half a fathom, while the man in the stern snatches his pole from the water and drives it fiercely down again and holds her up once more against the torrent. Perhaps his pole slips, or gets jammed between two stones, or in spite of all their efforts to keep her end-on to the stream, the boat's head slews a little on one side, and away you float helplessly down stream, only to make another effort, and if necessary another and another, until the obstacle is overcome. At last it is overcome : inch by inch, foot by foot, yard by yard, the quivering bark struggles up, till with a final powerful shove she is lifted over the break of the fall, and glides into still water above. The three principles of poling are : first, never to put out your strength until you know, by the feel of it, that your pole is firmly fixed, and does not rest on some loose or smooth and slippery stone. Secondly, to be careful to exert your force in a line parallel with the keel of the canoe, and to keep your pole perpendicularly under you, so that you can draw the canoe towards it or push her away, according as you may wish. If you plant your pole too far out or too much under the canoe, and throw your weight across her or hang over on your own side, a capsize is probable, if not inevitable. Thirdly, if your pole gets jammed and you cannot snatch it out in a second, let go instantly ; for if you hold on and drag at it, either the canoe will upset or she will slip in the most miraculous manner from under your feet, and you will find yourself suspended for a second in space, and then plunged into a raging flood.

We made camp early that afternoon, for the work had been very severe, and we needed rest ; but seeing a lot of salmon on the shallows, we determined, in spite of fatigue, to do a little bit of poaching and burn the water before turning in. An Indian fish-spear is a very simple affair, but it is far superior to any civilised instrument of the same kind. It consists of a straight iron spike about six inches long, let into the end of a pole of ash, or some other heavy wood, and two wooden jaws lashed one on each side of the spike. These jaws must be made of some tough elastic material, and are so shaped as to be furnished with broad barbs on the inner sides. There is a space of about six inches between the points of the jaws, which project an inch or two beyond the end of the iron spike, but the barbs are not more than a couple of inches apart ; beyond and inside the barbs the jaws open out again to a breadth of about four or five inches. When a fish is fairly struck, the wooden jaws expand, the iron spike transfixes him, the weight of the blow forces him up above the barbs, and the

jaws closing in again, hold him as fast as though he were in a vice. This kind of spear is very light and handy. It holds a salmon as securely as any lyster, and it does not gash and mangle the fish. The material for the wooden portion of our spear was not difficult to procure, but we were puzzled to find anything that would do for the indispensable iron spike, and at last had to make up our minds to sacrifice the handle of the frying-pan. No sooner said than done. In a few minutes the rivets were knocked out, and the handle stuck in the embers of the fire. While some of us were manufacturing the spike by beating out the handle on an axe-head and afterwards grinding it to a sharp point on a smooth stone, one of the Indians was hard at work making the pole and jaws with his hatchet and crooked knife. With these two implements an Indian will make anything. I have often watched with admiration a man fell a maple-tree, and in an hour or two turn out a smooth, delicately poised, accurately shaped axe-haft or paddle, with the help of no other tools than his axe and his crooked knife, an instrument which he generally makes for himself out of a file, and which resembles in shape the drawing knife of a shoeing smith. There is one peculiarity about the red man worth mentioning, namely, that in using a knife he invariably cuts towards his body, while a white man always cuts away from his. The Indians of all the coast provinces are skilful workmen with the crooked knife, and earn a good deal of money by making butter firkins, tubs, mast-hoops, and various articles of a similar nature.

By sunset we had finished our spear, and had collected a good supply of birch bark; and as soon as it was dark a couple of us launched a canoe, and after lighting a bunch of birch bark stuck in a cleft stick in the bow of the boat to act as a torch, started on our poaching expedition. We all of us had a turn at spearing, and most comical attempts we made. An empty canoe is possessed by a most malignant spirit of perversity: it floats light as a dry leaf upon the water, and spins round and round, and insists on going in the wrong direction, and displays a propensity to slip suddenly from under your feet, and in fact behaves altogether in a very fickle and cantankerous manner. Mishaps, though frequent, were only ludicrous; for the water was shallow, salmon were numerous, and in spite of our awkwardness we had fresh fish for supper that night. We made good progress next day, and arrived at our old camp on the first lake about sunset. It rained in perfect torrents that night, and we had a most uncomfortable time of it, carrying across to Indian Brook. The water had fallen so much since we were there, that we found it necessary to make a portage of six miles instead of two, so as to strike the river lower down. It is no joke, carrying canoes six miles over a rough ground, and though our Indians worked splendidly, it did not want many hours to dawn by the time we had got everything across, and were changing wet clothes for damp ones, and trying to dry ourselves

before a huge fire, under the partial shelter of a hastily arranged lean-to. If we had only known that it was going to rain so hard, we might have been spared the trouble of making the long portage, for when day broke we found the stream had risen at least a foot, and was coming down in a torrent that bore us rapidly towards the sea. It was getting dusk when we approached the most ticklish part of the navigation: we might truthfully have sung

Row, brothers, row, the stream runs fast,
The rapids are near and the daylight past;

and under any other circumstances we would have camped for the night; but we were so anxious to save our time with the steamer, that we determined to chance the rapids, and kept on our way after dark. It was a lovely night—a night the very memory of which is soothing to the heart: a night such as can be seen only in high latitudes; for, in spite of all the poetry that has been written on the subject, I maintain that no sultry southern night can compare in beauty with the great glory of the moonlit or star-studded heavens revealed through the clear and frosty atmosphere of the icy north. The broad friendly moon rose above the pine trees, climbed up among the stars, drowning their feeble beams with a deepening flood of radiance, and hung suspended in the heavens, a globe of mellow light, searching out the secrets of the forest, shining white on some fir tree bleached and dead, throwing black and awful looking shadows from the living pines, glimmering on the ragged bark and creamy stems of birch trees, casting the river fringe of alders into deepest gloom, tracing bands of silver across still reaches of the stream, dancing and flickering on the rapids, glittering like diamonds on frozen raindrops clinging to the stiffening blades of grass, half revealing strange mysterious forms, dimly unveiling misty distances, and shedding a peaceful softened lustre over the whole scene. The night was still. Silence settled down upon the earth with the sinking sun—a silence broken now and then by the plunge of an otter, the hoot of an owl, the rise of some startled wild fowl from the sedge, or the snapping of a dead stick under the light footfall of some beast of the forest, disturbed by the occasional splash of the steersman's paddle. So drinking in the beauties of the night, we drifted quietly on till the quickening current warned us to concentrate all our thoughts upon our own safety. The moonlight was so bright, and objects were so distinctly visible as long as we were in still water, that we anticipated but little difficulty in running the rapids, which are not the least dangerous by day; but as soon as we got among them the difference between the light of even a cloudy day and the clearest night became very evident. Our canoes were deeply laden, and so heavy that it was impossible to check them in the strength of the stream; and we flew down with such velocity that there was no time to pick a channel, and one found

oneself right on top of some rock or boiling eddy almost at the same instant that the eye caught sight of the danger. Yet our progress was slow, for in many places the river spreads out over broad shallows, and there we had to go very cautiously, creeping along, holding the canoe back with the paddles, grounding now and then, and having to back off and seek some deeper place; and it was long past midnight when a distant welcome roar showed we were approaching the fall. There we went ashore, made a fire, brewed some strong green tea, rested for half an hour, and then having made the short 'portage,' launched our canoes again below the fall. As bad luck would have it, the tide was out, and we had to pick our way over great flats of sand miles in breadth, covered by only two or three inches of water, through which a little narrow shallow channel went meandering to the sea. It was tedious work, and it was four o'clock in the morning when we got into deep water, paddled alongside the tug, roused up the crew, tumbled up on deck, and turned into our bunks below, thoroughly tired out.

So ended our hunting trip in Newfoundland. It was not very successful; three cariboo heads and one bear-skin were all the trophies we had to show. We could not congratulate ourselves upon the amount of game killed, but at any rate we did not come back empty-handed, and we had seen something of the country and had enjoyed a very pleasant month in the woods.

Newfoundland is not much visited by Englishmen. I know not why, for it is the nearest and most accessible of all their colonies, and it offers a good field for exploration and for sport. The interior of a great part of the island, all the northern part of it in fact, is almost unknown. The variety of game is not great, there are no moose or small deer, and bears are, strange to say, very scarce; but cariboo are plentiful, and the Newfoundland stags are finer by far than any to be found on any portion of the continent of North America. The cariboo, or reindeer, are getting scarce, as they are also in every other accessible place. Constant travel across the island interferes with their annual migration from north to south and from south to north. They are no longer to be seen crossing Sandy Pond in vast herds in the spring and fall, but no doubt they are still pretty plentiful in some remote parts of the country. The shores of Newfoundland are indented with numerous and excellent harbours, the interior is full of lakes and is traversed by many streams navigable for canoes, fur is pretty plentiful, wild fowl and grouse abundant, and the creeks and rivers are full of salmon and trout.

A great portion of the interior of the island consists of barren, swamp, and water, but there are large tracts of valuable timber, and of good land suitable in every way for farming purposes. The climate is very pleasant in summer and the fall; the winters are cold, though not so severe as on the mainland, but they are protracted far

into the spring, through the chilling influence of the great mass of Baffin's Bay ice that comes down the coast about the month of March. For that reason, and because the extent of good land is limited, and also on account of the proximity of Prince Edward's Island and the mainland, where both soil and climate are better suited to the cultivation of crops, Newfoundland will never be much of an agricultural country. It has great mineral riches, chiefly consisting of copper, which as yet are only partially developed, but the true source of its wealth and cause of its prosperity is, and always will be, the sea. There is a farm which needs no cultivation, a mine which never 'peters out.' The hardy Newfoundland fisherman pursues his calling not only among his native bays, but also along the coasts of the Labrador as far north as the entrance into Hudson's Straits; and yet, in spite of all his industry and the inexhaustible riches of the sea, he leads a poor, and too often a miserable life. He is generally deeply in debt to the nearest storekeeper, and he is compelled to look on while others reap the harvest drawn from what he, perhaps not unnaturally, considers his own seas. The fishery question in Newfoundland, and in fact the whole state of the country, is in a peculiar condition.

Most Englishmen probably suppose that Newfoundland is a dependency of Great Britain; but that idea is only partially true, for the sovereign rights of the Crown are recognised only over a portion of the island. The fishery rights of France, as settled under the treaty of Utrecht in 1713, still remain in force. Under that treaty the islands of St. Pierre and Miguelon were absolutely secured to France to enable her to pursue the cod-fishery of the great banks, and she further retained certain vaguely defined rights over that part of the island known as the French coast, namely, the shore from Cape Ray to Cape John, a distance of about 400 miles. The possession of the two islands above mentioned is of the greatest value to France, and at the same time causes no practical inconvenience to the Newfoundlanders. It is true that a great industry has passed from us, and that the fishery on the great banks is almost entirely in the hands of the French, who employ about 300 vessels and 10,000 men—half the number of ships and seamen engaged in their Newfoundland fishery, in that branch of the trade alone; but this is not owing to the convenience offered them by the possession of fishing stations at St. Pierre, or to any lack of industry and enterprise on the part of our men, but is caused by the high bounties given by the French Government, which enable their fishermen to undersell our people, and renders competition on our part useless. The state of things existing on the French shore is, however, looked upon as a real grievance by the English inhabitants of Newfoundland. France claims a strip of land half a mile in width along the whole western seaboard of the island. She also, practically speaking, owns half the interior of the island. What is the exact

nature of the rights which she is entitled to exercise over the fore-shore has never yet been determined. It was retained for fishery purposes. The French cannot erect permanent buildings of any kind, but they may set up temporary huts and drying stages, and everything necessary for the accommodation of their men during the fishing season. So much is clearly understood. But whether the French rights are exclusive; or whether the English may also make use of the shore for fishing purposes; or if not, then whether they are also precluded from permanently settling and cultivating land, or working minerals on the French shore, are doubtful points; but they will have to be decided some day, for the state of things which now exists, though it might have been thought little of when Newfoundland was a mere storehouse for salt, and a drying-place for the nets of fishermen who paid it an annual visit, will become unbearable as the island develops and is settled up. It is not the fisheries alone that are concerned. If you make a man absolute master of the door, it is obvious that he practically controls the room within; and as the natural and only outlet for nearly half the island is through the French shore, it is equally certain that the wealth in mines, timber, and agricultural produce of many thousands of square miles must remain undeveloped until some satisfactory arrangement is arrived at. Thanks to the tendency of treaty makers to scamp their work, and to be content to accept vague generalities and to leave inconvenient details to be dealt with by their successors, a nice muddle exists in Newfoundland. The Crown exercises sovereign right, and the Colonial Parliament extends its rule over a portion only of a British colony. And now, to make confusion worse confounded, we have entered into more vague and ill-defined engagements with the United States. Nobody seems even to know whether American fishermen can exercise their rights subject to or independent of the local laws binding on the natives of Newfoundland. Still less can any one pretend to say what rights, if any, the United States acquired on the French shore. The Fishery Convention between Great Britain and the United States was of course subject to the provisions of all existing treaties entered into by France and England, and dealing with the fisheries of Newfoundland, but nobody knows what those provisions mean. We may take one view, France a second, Newfoundland a third, and the Government of Washington a fourth. Who is to say which view is correct? The result of this confusion is, that there is no law whatever on the French shore. That country is inhabited by refugees from other parts of the island, and emigrants from Cape Breton or Prince Edward's Island, and from Nova Scotia and other portions of the mainland. These people, many of whom had urgent private reasons for thinking a change of domicile desirable, have squatted on the land and appropriated it—stolen it, in fact, from the Crown. Each family or cluster of families forming a little settlement, claims the

land about them, the valley probably of the river on the banks of which they dwell, and are fully prepared to uphold their claim. It is a delightfully primitive state of society. No writs run in that happy land, and every man does that which seems best to him in his own eyes. • Taxes, however, have been raised, but when the Colonial Parliament passed a Bill giving two members to the district, the Act was at once disallowed by the Home Government, as interfering with the French rights; and the curious spectacle might have been seen of a population of British subjects in a colony enjoying free Parliamentary Government, paying taxes, but having no representation whatever. There are many other inconveniences arising from the peculiar circumstances connected with the French shore. The Government is, practically speaking, precluded from making grants of Crown lands over about 20,000 square miles of country; nobody cares to purchase and clear land or prospect for minerals; millions of feet of lumber have been cut from off Crown lands without the payment of one farthing, and the rivers are persistently barred and the salmon fisheries destroyed. There is, in fact, a state of things existing in Newfoundland which finds no parallel in any civilised country in the world, and which is unknown in any other colony of Great Britain. In the midst of a self-governing community a population exists owning no allegiance to any one, liable to no laws, practically speaking subject to no Government of any kind. It is an anomalous and not a very creditable state of things. Whether it can be remedied or not is altogether another matter, but if possible something should be done for our own credit and for the sake of our fellow-subjects in Newfoundland. Newfoundland has special claims upon us, for though sentiment is generally out of place in politics, it cannot be forgotten that Newfoundland is England's first-born. That foggy little island, although perhaps somewhat of a rough diamond, is a valuable jewel, and is the first that was set in our imperial crown.

DUNRAVEN.

A DAY WITH A WAR BALLOON.

I.

So many people seem to take a lively interest in balloons and ballooning, that perhaps it may be worth while to note down the following short account of some early experiences and first impressions with balloons before they fade away from the memory.

July 28.—This is the third day that we have been hard at work making gas for balloons in the Arsenal at Woolwich with an experimental apparatus. The process of manufacturing hydrogen by blowing steam through heated iron turnings presents no great novelty in principle, for the French used it for inflating their military balloons as long ago as the battle of Fleurus in 1794; and, to judge by the meagre accounts which have reached us, they appear to have been very successful in the manufacture. In these days of competitive examinations and Staff College certificates the soldier has to use his pen as much if not more than his sword, and the military student of the future will be overwhelmed with records only too voluminous and elaborate of every detail of our military equipment. But in those days, under the stern *régime* of a revolutionary convention, the sword had decidedly the best of it, so no detailed records of the French and their work are available. We must be content to learn our experience from the beginning, and find out how to manufacture our hydrogen for ourselves. We are at present very new to the work, and we have to contend with many difficulties. Yet we do manage to make hydrogen. The worst of it is that when we have got it, it is very difficult to keep it, for it is the most subtle and difficult to retain of any gas which we could possibly use. So we cannot avoid a serious loss by leakage, though our light balloon fabric does retain it much better than might fairly be expected.

But to-day being fine and favourable for ballooning, it is time to forsake the gas furnace, and get a little practical experience as an *aéronaut*. The *Talisman*, as the balloon is named which we propose to employ, being already half full of hydrogen, is filled up completely with gas, and I first try a captive ascent.

A strong rope, perhaps 4,000 feet long, is wound upon a large

drum, whence it can be paid out or hauled in, as required, by means of a winch and brake. The end of the rope is carefully made fast to the Talisman's hoop. This is a strong circle of ash, to which all the terminal cords of the balloon netting above are fastened, and below which again the car is suspended by proper car-lines or connecting ropes. I get into the car. A sufficient number of bags of sand as ballast are introduced, to leave only a moderate lift or ascensional power in the balloon. The rope pays itself out readily from the drum as the Sapper in charge eases off the brake. The Talisman soars aloft, and whenever the pace is too rapid it is easily checked by a light application of the brake.

This is almost my first introduction to captive work, and the sensation is most decidedly not too pleasant or reassuring. The great balloon above tugs and struggles, as if perfectly conscious of a humiliating state of captivity, and longing to be free. This is especially the case whenever a gust of wind puts a considerable extra strain on the guy rope. The latter, as I have said, is fastened to the hoop above one's head. But it rides against the light wicker-work of the car, which creaks and groans in response in a doleful and somewhat distressing manner. Were it not for a powerful spring of india-rubber, which checks the oscillations of the guy rope, and tends to steady the balloon, the effect on one's nerves might be much worse than it is.

But, fortunately, there is not too much time for noticing these matters, for there is a constant necessity for letting go ballast, to meet the continually increasing weight of suspended guy rope below, or the balloon would soon cease to rise. At last the ballast is all expended, and the guy rope is paid out no further. The wind has caused the balloon to drift off to a considerable distance horizontally from the point of departure below, and she now settles into a condition of approximate equilibrium. The height above the ground is shown by the barometer to be about 1,000 feet. The long guy rope hangs in a graceful curve below. The portion next the balloon, for hundreds of feet, is nearly vertical, and that near the ground almost horizontal. But of this I see little. One or two timid glances are quite sufficient, for one's head, naturally a very indifferent one where it is a question of looking down from giddy heights, is not yet acclimatised to the situation by practice in ballooning. So I cannot look at the ground under, or nearly under, the balloon without a shudder and a decidedly creepy sensation. Above all, one must avoid looking down the guy rope, for this, in its long catenary, extending far below, reach after reach, and ending almost in a vanishing point, gives a measure to the eye of the giddy height. And to look along it makes one's brain reel—far worse, as I afterwards find, than looking down from thrice the height in a free trip where there is no guy rope.

For military purposes, for reconnoitring that is, there can be

no question of the value of such a suspended point of observation as this. Every detail in the innumerable buildings below—the workmen going to and fro in their work, the ships passing and repassing on the Thames, the Beckton gas-works on the further shore and lower down the river, the Artillery exercise ground on Woolwich Common, the Herbert Hospital and other buildings further away—everything is seen, and in the clearest possible manner. For there is a very sensible advantage in the clearness of view from a balloon as contrasted with that obtained at the ground level, even where the latter is perfectly free and unobstructed by obstacles. It is well known to astronomers, and to all who have to make careful observations of distant objects, that the vision in a horizontal or nearly horizontal direction is greatly interfered with by the unseen exhalations from the ground, and the varying density of the lowest strata of air at and near the ground. Whereas at a high angle, as here from the balloon, the rays of light have only to traverse a very limited amount of these disturbed strata, and are consequently much more unimpeded and reliable.

But the day is wearing on, and I want to get away as early as possible for a free run, so I signal with a flag to lower. The drum is set in motion, and the Sappers below apply themselves steadily to wind the Talisman down. This is rather a long business, and the oscillations of the rope which it causes give rise to sensations which remind me very unpleasantly of the rolling of a vessel at sea in a ground swell. It is not without much thankfulness that at last *terra firma* is reached.

The Talisman has lost some considerable amount of gas in the captive ascent, owing to the expansion due to the diminished barometric pressure at 1,000 feet from the ground. This loss is quickly replenished, that the start may be made with a full balloon, and about 4 P.M. all is ready.

The getting away, or starting, in a balloon is always rather a delicate and critical operation, and far more ballooning accidents have occurred probably, in connection with it, than at any other period, for it is by no means easy to regulate the ascension or lift of the balloon. This must be sufficient to clear all obstacles on the ground, but if it be too great the balloon would be carried upwards too fast and too far.

The case is rendered more difficult on this occasion by the circumstance that there are a set of telegraph wires close to the balloon ground, and down wind, which of course I must avoid. We make two or three false starts, to try the lift of the balloon, and haul her down again to alter the weight of ballast. But at last I am off safely with a moderate 'ascension' at 4.15 P.M. I am quite alone, as before in the captive ascent, for the balloon is rather too small to carry two persons well, in addition to a sufficient quantity of

ballast. Moreover, I shall learn my experience far better when thus left to one's own resources.

After noting with much satisfaction that we have cleared the telegraph wires, and are rising steadily at a moderate rate, so that there is time to attend to necessary matters, the first thing to be done is to see that the valve line is hanging ready to hand, and disentangled from the other ropes, for it might easily have got foul of something in the swaying and bumping of the balloon before she was set free. I glance upwards at the same time to make sure that the 'petticoat,' or tail of the balloon, is freely open; for were this tied up in its normal condition on the ground, the expansion of the imprisoned gas on rising to any considerable height would infallibly burst the balloon. The next thing is to take the aneroid barometer from the case wherein it has hitherto lain, for protection from the shocks of starting, and fasten it up in a convenient position for observation on one of the side car-lines.

I note while tying it up that it shows that we are rising steadily, but not too rapidly. Next the pilot line must be thrown overboard, and left hanging from the hoop. This is a strong cord measuring 100 feet, and its use is to guide the eye as to one's distance from the ground in descending. It has been lying in a rough coil at the bottom of the car, to prevent its getting entangled at starting. I now overhaul it and pay it out of the balloon.

The view of the ground below, which one gets while leaning over the side of the car, to see that the pilot line has not fouled in its extension, is the first look I have really had to see what we are doing and where we are going. These little necessary preliminary operations have taken up every instant of time, and have been done, if the truth must be told, with a considerable amount of nervous haste.

That steady coolness which would clearly be a most desirable element in ballooning is hardly forthcoming, for this is the first time that I have found myself thus alone in a balloon with the whole responsibility of its management. So I am nervous just at starting. By-and-by, with more experience, one may hope to get steadier.

About this time a strong smell of gas warns me that the balloon is overfilled by expansion, and it is time to let out gas at the top, if one does not mean to be choked by the downward rush from the opening at the bottom. One steady pull on the valve line, and a sufficient quantity escapes at the top of the balloon to provide for present security.

Now there is time to look around. Vertically below the balloon, I dare not look, or only for a moment, my head not yet being educated to the required point. But looking over the side at a steep angle,

the decks of the steamers far below are a curious and interesting study, with the long black tails of smoke, which they are apparently dragging after them, for we are passing over the Thames. It lies below in a broad silver sheet, with the sun shining upon it. On either side its numerous windings and snake-like folds are clearly visible, ending in a forest of innumerable masts and spires on the London side. Conspicuous therein are the transverse streaks representing the several bridges, and a few prominent buildings, such as the Houses of Parliament and St. Paul's Cathedral. Eastwards, on the side of the sea, the tortuous folds lose themselves in the broad estuary which opens out towards the Nore.

Now we are on the Essex side of the river. The balloon has reached her equilibrium level at about 2,000 feet, and for a short time she floats horizontally along. For a short time only—for the impossibility of keeping a balloon in such a continuous horizontal course is a leading difficulty in ballooning, although some approximation may be made to it by skilful and fortunate management. My balloon soon begins to settle downwards again.

Were she left to herself she would tend to run down faster and faster, and soon reach the earth. I allow her to descend slowly, but I prevent any such acceleration by throwing small quantities of ballast at intervals, watching the barometer all the time for guidance as to the amount required. I am most careful not to throw too much ballast, otherwise she would turn upwards again, and, unless checked by letting out gas with the valve, would run up higher than before. By watching carefully, and thus gradually drawing out the balloon's descending path into a line more and more nearly horizontal, I manage to get her on a horizontal course at length, and about 100 feet from the ground. Every time the pilot line—which is 100 feet long—drags on the ground I throw a little ballast, just enough to lift it clear again without giving the balloon any decided upward turn. Thus we glide rapidly along pretty near the ground for several miles, and I am so successful in this delicate operation of keeping the balloon in equilibrium, that perhaps at last one grows a trifle careless. The pilot line drags on a meadow below, and the friction gives the balloon a downward turn, which increases every instant as more of the line drags behind in the long grass. I instantly throw whatever small quantity of ballast is ready to hand at the moment, just to gain time, and my back having been now for some time turned in the direction of our course, I glance round to see that the country ahead is clear of obstacles in case we come to the ground. Horror! we are driving rapidly right on to a high tree. I can only allow myself one single half-second to make up one's mind whether to throw the grapnel, open the valve if necessary, and descend at once, or to throw out a quantity of ballast instead to lift her, and try to clear the tree. The former course would bring my trip to a premature conclusion, and if

the grapnel should not hold very well I shall drive into the tree to a certainty. The latter is clearly the more sporting line to take, though somewhat hazardous. At all events it is the one selected. I seize a heavy bag of ballast with both hands, heave it up with all my strength, and throw it bodily over.

The balloon must have a few moments to turn upwards, but while she is so doing we are driving rapidly on, and nearing the tree fast. The collision seems inevitable. But I reckon that when once the balloon has fairly turned upwards she will ascend very rapidly.

It is an exciting situation, for she does rise so fast that I am in doubt whether we shall not pull clear up to the very last moment. Her envelope and netting, as she lifts, brush close past the outermost twigs without catching in them—only a few seconds more and we should have cleared the tree splendidly. But now it is too late, for the car hangs too far below the balloon.

At the last moment, seeing the collision inevitable, I seize two opposite car lines, or connecting ropes between the car and the hoop above, pull them well in, that the others in front may shield my knuckles from the oncoming boughs, hold on to them very tightly, crouch down at the bottom of the car, with my legs extended horizontally in front of me, and press my feet firmly against the forward side of the wicker car, to support it with the strength and momentum of my body. The next instant we are into the tree with a tremendous crash. It is a large elm, and we strike it perhaps fifteen or twenty feet from the top, right in the centre, and in a direction inclining upwards. The next instant I find myself right in the middle of the tree, with the car dancing like a shuttlecock among the larger branches. Most fortunately the oval car is end on as regards the tree, so that its smaller and stronger section is presented to it. All the smaller outside boughs have been wrenched off or bent aside, and they have no doubt rendered most valuable service by checking our momentum gradually. I am still crouching low down in the car for protection, and holding on with all my strength to avoid being tossed out. On glancing up I am well pleased to see that nothing has given way. Every one of these slight-looking cords which suspend me from the hoop would hang me, and the car, and the ballast, and a barrow-load or two of bricks into the bargain, over a precipice with perfect safety. Not one of them has gone. On my side nothing goes, so it is pretty evident that the tree must go.

At every gust of wind the great balloon above tugs and struggles like a captive Leviathan longing to be free. There is a riving, a cracking, a smashing, and a rending, and bough after bough is wrenched aside or torn off. No matter how large and strong they seem, it is all one.

The car ploughs its way steadily on, foot by foot forwards and

upwards right through the tree. Soon we are free, and with an exulting bound the balloon soars upwards once more. But stay—not so fast—there is a tremendous jerk, and, had I not fortunately been still holding on tightly to the friendly car-lines, I might have been shot between them right out of the car into empty space. The sudden check arises from the grapnel rope, which was hanging in a single long bight—fifty feet below the car.

The bight of the rope has caught over a large bough below, and pulled us up with a round turn. The situation is a little awkward, for I seem to be hung up half way between heaven and earth. But before entertaining the question of cutting away the grapnel rope, we will see what the balloon herself can accomplish. She responds to the call, for she surges and tugs more valiantly than ever. Again there are sounds of cracking and rending below: one or two more strong jerks, as the rope, after breaking one large bough, catches on another, and we are really free once more. I glance aloft and around. We have positively no damage whatever, nor any token of the encounter, except one or two small boughs which we have carried away triumphantly sticking in the cordage above as trophies of our victory. It is clear from the last part of the adventure that it is a mistake where trees are concerned to have the grapnel rope hanging loose. So my first care is to make it up into a coil, which I lash alongside the car. The balloon is rising very rapidly, but I will let her go as high as she will, and even throw more ballast if necessary. For the present currents near the ground are taking us nearly straight for the sea, and I will try if haply there is a more favourable current up above. Moreover, the successful result of the encounter with the tree has inspired one with a spirit of adventure, and I want to see what sort of a world may be on the other side of the dark cloud masses above. Upwards we rush accordingly, and soon enter the clouds. They are dense. I am instantly shut in on every side, and cannot see the width of my balloon away in the thick masses of whirling vapour.

We still rise rapidly, as is clear from the steady fall of the barometer, but the clouds are so thick that we are a long time in getting through them.

At last in a moment we seem to emerge, as if from a close and stifling pit of Avernus, into bright sunshine and the upper regions. We soar higher and higher as the hot sun expands the gas. Soon we have left every cloud far below us, and I find myself indeed in a new world.

II.

Alone in a balloon, far above the highest cloud, and how lonely who in the world below can tell? Doubtless there is a loneliness on earth, as we wander in solitude in the wild and untenanted desert, on the lonely ocean shore, or in the mysterious gloom of some huge tropical forest. And there is a deep moral and spiritual loneliness in the strange and crowded city, where every one is hurrying on his own unregarding way; or in the fading daylight and oncoming darkness as we linger in some forsaken cemetery, where lie the remains of those who in life were dearer to us than life itself. But the desert has its tenants, be it only the slinking jackal below, or the soaring vulture above. The sea is always alive and replete with interest, with its innumerable ripples or its mighty waves in storm or calm. The forest is peopled, and full of sound and motion, be it of insect, or animal, or bird. The strange city abounds in human interest. Every new face is a study of a human life, and a record of a brother's experience. The solitary cemetery, with its sad monumental inscriptions, though it tells of separation, tells also of hope and renewal. It takes us back to the past and forward to the future. Even the dust beneath our feet is a link to bind us closer to our common humanity. Everywhere there is life or life's associations; everywhere ties and connecting cords to appeal to our own human life, and prevent us from feeling altogether alone. And he knows little of the human heart who knows not the power of these things and how we cling to them. The familiar nibbling mouse, the accustomed spider, the regular bugle-call, the sentry's well-known challenge, have saved many a poor prisoner in his lonely cell from madness and despair.

But here, in these eternal solitudes, there is no familiar form, no accustomed face, no sound, no voice, no life: only one vast untenanted abyss—only one deep unfathomable calm.

It is therefore, perhaps, no marvel that the first effect of this intense loneliness is neither moral nor spiritual, but essentially sensuous. The sensuous soul, the Psyche, sees herself suddenly stripped of all those innumerable external ties which had a powerful though unseen hold upon her everywhere below. The great gulfs which lie between her and them, and that dark, impenetrable cloud-curtain which everywhere enshrouds them, seem to her quickened apprehension like long centuries, æons, of dreadful isolation and severance. She shivers, forlorn and naked, in the unknown void. For a while, indeed, she struggles and bears up. She is not prepared thus all at once without an effort to resign, together with all old associations, her hold upon the past, her volition in the present, her foresight and interest in the future.

All in vain. The situation is far too strong for her. For now, like deep draughts of intoxicating wine, the subtle but potent influence of this overpowering repose steals in at every pore. It thrills through every fibre of one's being. It rises higher and higher, wave on wave, like a mighty flood. It takes undisturbed possession. 'All is for gotten. The great world below, so lately left, so manifold and rich in its myriad interests, has become an unregarded lump of pitiful dirt, which I may possibly have seen in some remote past; but I know not, and I care not, whether I shall ever see it again. Home, family, friends, affections, hopes, ambitions, all fade away. They are as the memory of a vanishing dream. They are not. The Present, the entrancing Present, rules absolutely supreme.

I dare not move; it would be a desecration. Speech were profanity. The sound of my own voice, breaking in upon this awful silence, would jar upon the ear as harshly as would the loud boisterous song of some profane and drunken reveller disturbing the devout worshipper in the still and solemn aisle of a cathedral at midnight. It is with extreme reluctance that I force myself to make a slight necessary movement of one arm. The little creaking of the wicker car which this involves makes me shudder. The small sound is quickly gone, it is true. It goes out and returns not. It is instantly devoured—swallowed up and lost in the unfathomable gulfs which open out on every side. There is no cloud near to give back even the faintest murmur of an echo.

It is only, of course, at first that one's sensations seem so purely sensuous. Indeed the situation is not without moral and spiritual lessons of the highest order, and to these, let us hope, we are not altogether blind or dead. Here there is nothing but the Almighty and His greatest works. And we can, in some faint and far-off measure, understand how small in His sight must be the little rivalries, the narrow prejudices, the unworthy jealousies, the petty anxieties, the fashionable trivialities, which make up so much of our lives below. Here, far above it all, we feel as if, like Lear and Cordelia in their coveted prison, we could

take upon us the mystery of things
As if we were God's spies.

His greatest works. Surely sun and sky and cloud are these. And here there is nothing else, and we see them in an unimagined perfection. The Sun is no longer the sun which we know so well on earth. There he is perpetually half obscured, and even on the brightest summer's day he has to shine through innumerable varying layers of lower, moister, and denser atmosphere, which half quench his rays. But here he is a mighty burning orb, illuminating everything with one overpowering flood of glorious light. And such is the power of his rays, that without a thermometer I should be quite un-

conscious of the circumstance that the temperature of the surrounding air has fallen twenty or thirty degrees since we left the earth.

The sky, when on the ground, was quite obscured by clouds. As we ascended higher, and it came, here and there, into view, it was of the usual milky 'sky-blue' tint. It has grown brighter and brighter, bluer and more blue as we rose; and now it is of an intensely deep Prussian blue colour, like its hue at midnight on an exceptionally clear night. It is a glorious, shining firmament of deepest transparent sapphire. In the whole grand hemisphere there is not one solitary minutest speck to mar its absolute unity and perfection. For we have left far behind every trace of fog or mist or vapour, together with the whole apparatus for their manufacture. We gaze everywhere uninterruptedly into the transparent blue ether of illimitable space.

The clouds are all far below. Their first effect when we rose above them was that of a vast, lustrous, many-rippled lake of snow-white gossamer cirrus. A little later, as we rose higher, and the larger masses below came more and more into view, in the wide intervals between the floating cirrus, they constituted a mighty ocean, with huge tumbling billows, and each billow seems huger and more wonderful than the last. But far away, towards the horizon, their giant forms melt gradually down and mingle with the cirrus, as the distance continually increases, until at last the vanishing point takes the form of a distinct and clear horizontal arc. This is as well defined all round the entire circumference as the ocean horizon at sea, and upon it I could take a sextant observation fully as well.

Besides these three grand elements of Sun and Sky and Cloud, there is nothing, apparently, in the whole universe but my tiny car, and the soaring balloon above. Stay—far below, projected horizontally on a gigantic cloud, I see another and a far larger balloon, with car, *aéronaut*, ropes, every detail distinct and clear. It is the shadow of my own balloon, enormously elongated, half a mile long, or it may be ten miles; for I have no means of judging distances in this vast abyss wherein I float, an utterly insignificant speck, with no single known or fixed point anywhere, other than the sun overhead. These then make up the apparent sum total of things. A simple total. But all monotony in the picture is amply dispelled by the wonderful variations of form and colour in the clouds themselves. From the lightest snowy flecks of floating cirrus, through all conceivable or inconceivable shapes of giant cumulus, down to dense impenetrable layers of solid stratus,—there they are. Their forms, their hues, and grouping are perpetually changing. Not rapidly, that would be out of harmony with the scene. But in a slow, silent manner, which seems to eliminate the idea of motion, and harmonizes well. And the great sun above pours down upon them all alike one tremendous flood of dazzling radiance, giving rise alternately to the brightest of lights or

the deepest of shadows, according as they are exposed to, or screened from, his powerful rays.

At first it might well seem a wonder and a pity that no man has ever seen these magnificent clouds, and that no human eye ever will see them but mine. To the artist and to every loving worshipper of Nature in her grandeur and her beauty they would be naught else than an education, and a supreme delight. Yet doubtless, beings of another world, and with far better eyes than ours, behold their marvellous perfection, and rejoice. And, whether or no, let it abundantly suffice that the Allseeing eye of the great Creator is upon every one of them, and that His sovereign approbation has for ever stamped them as Good.

But now it is high time to attend to the balloon and her path. On entering the clouds and losing sight of the earth, I had, knowing that our course might be nearly straight for the sea, fixed a time by my watch, beyond which, on a rough estimate, we must on no account remain lost in the clouds, otherwise, on descending, I might find myself over the water. That time has now expired, or nearly so. The balloon has been travelling at her own will. For a considerable time after rising above the clouds the expansion of the gas due to the powerful direct rays of the sun sustained her well. But of late she has been settling slowly downwards. We are now between 6,000 and 7,000 feet from the ground. The clouds below are less dense than they were. Through rifts in their dark masses I begin to catch occasional fleeting glimpses of the earth. I lean over the edge of the car, and fancy that there is thus dimly to be discerned a long ill-defined line which might be the coast-line. A few moments later, and the truth is clear. There it is. The sea is below and most perilously close. We are driving right on to it. There is yet considerably more than a mile to fall. Shall I ever get down in time? or is it possible to stand on, husband the ballast carefully, and cross over? One glance at the size of the balloon and the limited quantity of ballast available should suffice to dismiss the last idea as quite impracticable. But I cannot help toying with the thought for a few moments. The truth is, that I have drunk so deeply of that intense repose which broods over all here like a presiding spirit, that I seize greedily on any excuse for putting off, just for a few moments longer, the inevitable time of energetic action. But every moment is precious. We are driving steadily on at an unknown rate. So with an effort I rouse myself, and seize the valve-line. One, two, three, four, five, six,—I count the time, holding the great valve on top of the balloon wide open. It would be sheer insanity, under any ordinary circumstances, thus to challenge my balloon to a headlong course downwards. But I am now fully awake to the situation. A decided effort must be made, and any half measures would be foredoomed to disastrous failure. I calculate that the clouds below will

tend to check the inevitable acceleration of speed in our downward course to a considerable extent. No doubt when we get through them I shall have to look out, for she will be likely to accelerate greatly; but there is sufficient ballast to enable me to put on a powerful brake to stop her down below. In any case it seems better to run any unknown risk, which the uncertainty as to stopping her involves, than to incur the absolute certainty of falling into the sea a little later on.

Down we go accordingly. I employ the short time available before we reach the clouds in piling up the bags of ballast on the seat of the car ready to hand for instant dismissal, keeping an intermittent eye on the barometer all the time. When we enter the clouds the whistle and swish of the light vapour as we rush through warns me plainly that we are travelling, but although the barometer is running up rapidly, it does not seem to indicate any marked increase of speed. This gives me time to cut adrift the lashing which ties up the grapnel rope, and to shake out the coils till the falling rope hangs in a single bight below. The grapnel itself I hang by its tines over the side of the car, all ready to let go. The clouds are thick, and before we are through them everything is in readiness for a landing. Still rapid progress, but no very marked acceleration of speed.

Now we are through, and the earth bursts upon us all at once. The sea is still a considerable distance off, and I am inclined to think that all is well. One more glance at the barometer—we are, say, 3,000 feet from the ground. I throw out a few pieces of paper. If they were to journey down alongside of us we should be falling rapidly, but at a reasonable rate. But now they rise sharply, and are soon left far above out of sight. Certainly we are travelling. I now watch the ground below steadily. We are over an open marsh. There are one or two solitary shepherds' cottages, and a few dykes full of water. These objects are apparently moving out from below to right or left. The rapidly increasing velocity of this, their angular movement of divergence from the vertical, together with the progressive enlargement in size of each field, or defined area below, gives some measure to the eye of the rapid rate of our progress downwards, and greater nearness to the ground. I throw more paper. It runs up faster than before. Shall I ever pull her up? But the sea is advancing steadily in a swift silent manner, which is not reassuring. We are driving fast right on to it. There is plenty of room under us yet, and I will stand on a little longer. But I heave up a heavy bag of ballast with both hands, poise it on the edge of the car, and hold it ready to throw.

All at once it strikes me that she is accelerating frightfully. The cottage, which at first seemed at rest right underneath us, and then was creeping slowly out to the left, is now going off at full

gallop like a runaway horse. The whole country immediately below has become an uncertain sort of moving phantasmagoria. We are 2,000 feet from the ground, by eye, for I dare not lose sight of the earth to look at barometers. Sea or no sea, I must bring her to while yet there is room, or surely I shall be smashed to pieces. Over goes the ponderous mass of ballast, bag and all; and more follow as fast as I can seize and throw them. Over they go, till I have only one bag left. The heavy sacks of wet sand go down like thunderbolts. They ought, of course, to be emptied of their contents, which would then descend as usual in a harmless shower. Probably there is nothing but marsh, or only a few cattle, below. But were there flocks and herds innumerable, and a stray shepherd or two into the bargain, I should be sorry to assert very positively that they would not have one and all to take their chance of a bag.

We are still running at a great rate, but it soon becomes clear that the balloon is losing her way. A little later, and she is bringing to. There is no longer an upward rush of air against my flattened hand held horizontally over the side of the car. The moving phantasmagoria has settled down into a well-defined ground plan. A piece of paper thrown over *descends*. The barometer, which I can now again afford to consult, informs me that we are a little under 1,000 feet from the ground. We have gained a thousand in pulling up.

Bad judgment, and badly done! For it is clear that I have greatly overdone the whole thing. Had one thrown only one-half that precious ballast up above there, just to check the balloon's course, and the remainder by successive instalments later on as required, we might now have been nearly on the ground, and moving towards it at a safe and manageable rate; whereas now she has lost all her way. We are still a long distance from the earth, with the sea very close. A long white line of hungry-looking foam is coming straight upon me with the speed of a railway train, and in a weird silent manner which half fascinates me.

And now her great downward momentum has carried her far below her true equilibrium level. Now, by all the laws which govern balloons, she is bound, if I let her go—like a light float driven forcibly down into a pool of water and then left to itself—to rise rapidly again. She will run up above the clouds once more, and carry me thousands of feet higher than we have ever yet been—to descend later on into the sea, miles from the shore, with a tremendous crash, for there will then be no ballast to stop her. We must get down now at all costs, if not on the land, then as near as possible to it. Below is a favourable marsh, covered with long rank grass. I have still one bag of ballast left, and the heavy grapnel to throw. This I can cut away, rope and all, if necessary; and she can hardly gather any very dangerous way now, however much gas I have to let out to get down in time.

There is no time for weighing such considerations as these before taking action, nor do I need any. For, indeed, at a crisis like this, as the plot steadily thickens, and your nerves get wound up more and more to the sticking point, your wits also seem to sharpen continually, until you arrive at a point at which you seize, as it were by inspiration, at a momentary glance, all the leading points of the situation, and translate them into instant action with a result as good, or better, than an hour's careful consideration would give at an ordinary time. The instant it became clear that the balloon was bringing to, or had already brought to, and before she had time to gather way upwards, I had seized the valve line and opened the valve full. I am now steadily letting out an enormous stream of gas, while thus reviewing and deliberately endorsing this sudden resolve. The sea is very near, and it will be a close race between us. Nevertheless, I am persuaded that the balloon has got the lead, and this time she shall keep it. So I do not let go the valve line till we are well on our downward course once more. I then heave up the last bag of ballast, rest it on the edge of the car, steady it there with one hand, take the heavy grapnel in the other, and stand by to throw them at the right moment. The half-empty balloon goes rapidly down, gathering way as she goes, but in the hundreds of feet that are now left she cannot possibly accelerate as in the thousands up above; and the more empty she gets the more her hollow underside tends to hold the air like a parachute. The last bag goes when we are something over a hundred feet from the ground. The grapnel follows immediately after, the moment I am sure that it will reach the ground, as its sustaining rope is a hundred feet in length. We are running hard after them; but the loss of their combined weight puts a powerful drag upon the balloon, which has now only me and the light wicker car to carry. She strikes the ground with a fairly good whack, it is true, but nothing at all to signify. At the last moment I spring upwards and hold on to the hoop, that the car may take the first bump. The next instant I am sprawling at the bottom of the car, with hoop and balloon right on top of me.

The poor balloon is utterly crippled by the loss of the great quantity of gas which I had to let out up above, together with all that has been forced through the pores of the envelope by the great pressure of air below in her downward rush. She has no heart left in her, even to attempt to rise again, so there is no question of her drifting, or dragging the grapnel. Had she been lively and buoyant, and the grapnel not held very well, she might most easily have contrived to dance over the sea-wall into the sea after all, with or without me.

Now one can afford to sit quietly down for a few moments, to recover from a somewhat dazed and bewildered state in which the smart landing, following on such a rapid fall, had left me. No harm

whatever has been done, except that I am partly deaf for a time. My ears seem half disposed to strike work. They further express their resentment at the great and sudden increase of barometric pressure to which their delicate drums have been exposed in such a hasty descent by sundry crackings and sudden noises at intervals. Two or three hours elapse before they recover their normal condition.

We have landed very near the sea-wall, and won the race by about one minute, more or less. Thus happily ends one of my earliest ballooning experiences.

c

HENRY ELSDALE.

THE EXHIBITING OF PICTURES.¹

ONCE upon a time Royal Academicians were fined for not exhibiting, and the Royal Academy was reproached for making profits by showing the paintings of outsiders to the public. The contrast between such a state of things and that which now exists is extraordinary; it is greater and probably more permanent than the difference between the present fashions in dress and those of our ancestors who dyed themselves with woad; for it is quite certain that thousands of painters will be anxious to exhibit their works next spring on the walls of the Royal Academy, while no one can venture to affirm that art-ladies may not soon cast off their jerseys and stain their bodies with 'peacock-blue.'

The very useful little book, the title of which is quoted below, affords admirable materials for considering the struggle for existence awaiting every picture which comes into the world; and to those who can appreciate the study, the hopes, the disappointments, the praises, and the discouragements which every picture, however bad, has brought upon its author, a canvas is almost as remarkable 'a bundle of possibilities' as a baby.

In our remarks upon the fate of these bantlings we shall make no distinction between the offspring of artists and amateurs. Works of art should stand upon their own merits, and the sources from which their authors pay their weekly bills afford no means of classifying such productions or estimating their artistic value. The broad distinction between the artist and the amateur is this, that the former lives, or desires to live, by the sale of his works, and that the latter is more or less independent of such a source of income. The artist may produce daubs which no one cares to buy, while the amateur may paint pictures which would command large prices if he were willing to sell them. As a rule most artists are better technically educated, can give more time to their art, and are therefore better painters than most amateurs, but many of them are artists from circumstances rather than from natural talent, and it is quite certain that some amateurs are in every respect superior to some artists.

It is, unfortunately, rather the fashion for artists to speak slight-

¹ *The Year's Art.* By Marcus B. Huish, LL.B. (Macmillan & Co., 1880.)

ingly of amateurs; but as the judgment passed upon a work of art should be wholly independent of its author's name and position, and as the works of the best artists are always very superior to those of the best amateurs, we are inclined to ascribe all sneers at amateurs as a class to the natural modesty of inferior professionals. •

Now when a man has painted a picture he naturally wishes it to be seen, either that it may be appreciated, if he is an amateur, or that it may be bought, if he is a professional artist. It is, therefore, necessary for every painter that he should have the opportunity of showing his works to the public; and the object of this paper is mainly to show how far the existing means of exhibiting answer their purpose, and how they might be extended or improved.

The Royal Academy demands our first and chief consideration in this matter, not only on account of its position and pretensions, but also from the fictitious value popularly ascribed to the judgment it is supposed to pass upon pictures.

During the London season, the Royal Academy is generally exposed to much abuse. It is reviled as an ill-selected, self-elected body, with a knighted president and vague privileges, whose duty it is to exhibit every decent picture that is sent to its rooms, but which neglects its duty and abuses its privileges by hanging only the miserable daubs of its members, and of those painters who have condescended to truckle for their favour. Baldly stated as this is, we may appear to have exaggerated the charge against the Royal Academy, but we will venture to affirm that it is no more than a fair summary of the things that are said about it from the time when the pictures are sent in till the close of the exhibition.

The main grievance urged against the Royal Academy is that it assumes to judge of the merits of pictures, and judges them very badly. This is an unfortunately common delusion on the part of the public, and is especially hurtful to the very persons in whose defence it is brought forward—the painters of ‘rejected’ pictures. Its falseness is well known in artistic circles, but the public in general do undoubtedly believe that the exhibition of a picture on the walls of the Royal Academy is a proof of its merit, and it is common to see in sale catalogues that the fact of its having been so exhibited is mentioned in order to enhance its value. The natural conclusion therefore follows that a picture sent in, but not accepted, has been condemned as a work of art by the best painters in the kingdom.

Now it is quite true that the Royal Academy is a self-elected body, but it would be very unfair to say that its members are on the whole ill selected: most of the best English painters belong to it; there are some very moderate performers in it, and some intolerably bad daubers, but although there are doubtless some artists still outside it who are far superior to some who have been admitted, it is probable that no other process of selection would have secured a

better Academy of painters, or would have given greater satisfaction to the public. Plenty of objections can easily be imagined against every conceivable mode of selection, from nomination by the Crown down to drawing by lot; and although the painters selected might not be the same, the result of any system would be very similar. There are good, bad, and indifferent men in both Houses of Parliament, and in every branch of the Government service. So that, in spite of competitive examinations, we must own with resignation, that the infallible method of selection has yet to be discovered.

The Royal Academicians and Associates, besides putting highly prized initials after their names, have the privilege of exhibiting eight pictures apiece in the halls of the Academy. As there are forty R.A.'s and thirty A.R.A.'s, they have the right of hanging up 560 pictures, and they are fully entitled to avail themselves of this privilege. In practice, however, either from modesty or other causes, they rarely do exhibit their full number of pictures. Last year, for instance, the members of the Royal Academy have only hung about 170 of their own works—not three apiece—and only two of them have contributed as many as seven, if we except Mr. Prinsep, whose one picture should count for thirty. There are, moreover, instances on record in which members have withdrawn some of their own pictures to make room for the productions of outsiders. It is, therefore, most unfair to represent the Royal Academy as a selfish body of painters who take advantage of their privileges to show off their own works, and to suppress those of their more meritorious rivals.

When the Royal Academy was founded there was certainly no expectation that its members would avail themselves too freely of their right to exhibit, for in Rule 17 of the 'Instrument,' the name given to the original code of the Institution, it is laid down that 'all Academicians, till they have attained the age of sixty, shall be obliged to exhibit at least one performance, under a penalty of 5*l.* to be paid into the Treasury of the Academy, unless they can show sufficient cause for their omission; but after that age they shall be exempt from all duty.'

The same rule prescribes that 'there shall be an annual exhibition of paintings, sculpture, and designs, which shall be open to *all artists of distinguished merit.*' Now putting the average number of pictures contributed by Academicians and Associates at 200, there is space each year for about 1,300 works of other painters. We give these figures as being tolerably near the mark; the precise numbers must of course depend upon the sizes of the pictures accepted. For these 1,300 places, between 6,000 and 7,000 works are sent in not only by 'artists of distinguished merit,' but by anybody who thinks fit to contribute his paintings. The necessary consequence is that the Royal Academy has to reject from 4,000 to 6,000 works, and the Council, according to the evidence given before the Royal Com-

mission in 1863, takes great pains in making what it believes to be a conscientious selection. Here is the great error which causes so much injustice and discontent. Were the Council composed of the best judges of pictorial art in its widest sense, and had it the task of picking out the 1,300 best pictures in all styles from 7,000 so arranged that all could be seen together, it would be sure to make some mistakes. But painters are notoriously bad critics. They have either the strong sympathies and antipathies peculiar to the artistic temperament, or, if mere, mechanical workmen, have no tolerance for methods which they do not follow or admire.

A test of the capability of the Royal Academy Council for selecting works of art is given by the purchases made by them under the Chantrey bequest. The task is a comparatively easy one. They have only to buy 'Works of Fine Art of the highest merit in Painting or Sculpture,' executed 'within the shores of Great Britain' 'by a deceased or living artist,' and they are not even bound to spend the whole or any part of the sum at their disposal 'in every or any one year.' During the last two years the selection made under these terms has met with general approval, but an inspection of the Chantrey bequest collection at the South Kensington Museum can only fill the visitor with amazement, and lead the most charitable critic to imagine that the Council had almost too conscientiously administered a benevolent fund for the purchase of unsaleable pictures.

The Council moreover cannot be expected to be impartial judges. In a competition for a prize-essay or poem the names of the writers are studiously concealed from the examiners until the prize has been adjudged, and in most cases it is probable that the examiners do not know anything of the competitors; but painters are gregarious, they know a great deal about each other's works, and although it is said that the names of the would-be exhibitors are never given until the fate of their pictures has been decided, the authorship of most of the works sent in must be known at a glance to every member of the Council; and under these circumstances no system of selection except drawing lots could possibly be impartial. We do not believe that a Council of Recording Angels would, under the circumstances, be quite free from favouritism.

What, then, is the ordeal to which 6,000 or 7,000 pictures are yearly subjected? They are trotted rapidly past a number of very prejudiced judges, who are bound to reject about 5,000 out of the whole lot.

And this is what the British public is pleased to call the verdict of the Royal Academy upon the pictures contributed.

It is grossly unfair upon the members of the Council, and still more unfair upon the Academicians who did not belong to it, to lay to their charge all the blunders which must inevitably result from

such a system, and they would do well to repudiate as far as possible all responsibility in the matter; but the Academicians at least lose nothing by the decisions they are supposed to have given, while to the painters of the so-called 'rejected' pictures the consequences are very serious; to some the refusal of their works brings bitter discouragement, to others ruin. No man who has been to a few Royal Academy exhibitions would venture to say that they had not contained some very bad pictures, and no one who knows anything of the paintings which have been refused, or not sent in for fear of refusal, would deny that a great many excellent works had been every year excluded. These things ought not to be, and the system which necessarily brings them to pass must be a bad one.

We wish it to be clearly understood that we do not in any way blame the Royal Academicians. They do their best—with most inadequate means—to discharge the impossible duties which are thrust upon them. They are treated by the public as infallible, and their judgments, when given, are derided. But we do think that the sooner they extricate themselves from their present position the better it will be both for them and for the great body of British artists.

Out of, say, 6,000 pictures sent in for exhibition, there are probably quite 4,000 which are fit to be seen. It is not possible to hang 4,000 pictures on walls where there is only room for 1,300. The 2,700 which are sent away are considered by the public to have been rejected as unworthy of a place, and their painters are undeservedly injured. Either, therefore, the Royal Academy should have space enough to hang all the fairly good pictures which are likely to be sent to its exhibition, or it should decline to receive on approbation the works of the whole painting world, and should reserve its spare room for 'artists of *distinguished merit*,' who should be invited to send in only as many pictures as could be properly accommodated. The first plan would do justice to all painters, the second would secure them from the disappointment and injury which so many of them now undeservedly sustain.

It has been suggested, in order to gain room for more painters, that the number of works exhibited by each should be limited to two; and also that the size of pictures should be greatly restricted. Both of these plans are objectionable, the first because it would impose fresh difficulties on the exhibitors and the Council, and the second because British art already suffers from the difficulty of hanging and selling those large works, which in France it is considered important to encourage by purchases from State Funds.

Another mode by which the Royal Academy might do justice to more pictures would be by having two exhibitions a year instead of one. The public has been much indebted to the Royal Academy for the Winter Exhibitions of the works of the 'Old Masters,' but if one of its duties be the proper representation of contemporary British

Art, that duty would certainly be better fulfilled by hanging the pictures which it is now obliged to refuse, than by exhibiting a collection of the paintings of defunct and chiefly foreign artists. The task of borrowing and showing these works would doubtless be taken up by some other society or gallery, as it formerly was by the British Institution in Pall Mall. If, moreover, the Royal Academy were unwilling to give up the 'Old Masters' exhibition, they might manage, by opening a little earlier, to get two exhibitions of modern pictures into the period of the London Season, as 'the Instrument' only requires that the paintings should remain on view for a month.

This suggestion may possibly cause an outcry against the terrible labour involved in arranging so many pictures twice or three times over, but a few hints from Messrs. Christie and Manson, who are accustomed to hang three rooms full of pictures once or twice a week, besides showing off innumerable collections of furniture, china, sculpture, books, &c. &c., would prove the possibility of carrying it into effect without much difficulty or loss of time.

The Royal Academy is, as we have already said, unfairly abused for not fulfilling the expectations which the public has formed of it; but the constant attacks upon it are not without meaning, and, if rightly understood, would seem to show that the institution should either decisively renounce those high expectations, and possibly some of its own pretensions, or should take effective steps for satisfying them.

Next to the Royal Academy the Grosvenor Gallery is perhaps the exhibition most visited by the artistic sight-seers. It belongs to Sir Coutts Lindsay, and was started in 1877, 'with the intention of giving special advantages of exhibition to artists of established reputation, some of whom had previously been imperfectly known to the public.' This intention it has doubtless in several instances fulfilled, but as 'pictures are only admitted on the invitation of the proprietor,' the gallery is not a place in which any painter can pretend to have the smallest right of exhibiting.

The Society of British Artists, in Suffolk Street, had in 1879 a very good exhibition; but as the members, who are fifty-seven in number, and have a preference in hanging, contributed 150 out of 793 works, there was but little room there for outsiders.

The Dudley Gallery exhibits about 450 cabinet pictures in oil during the winter; but the members of the committee have a great advantage in the hanging of their own performances, and the number of works refused is consequently large.

The Aquarium in Westminster has an exhibition of pictures. We do not know what are the rules for their admission, but as most of them are hung in the dark the collection is not attractive either to painters or sightseers.

There are one or two private galleries also, belonging to dealers,

containing the pictures which they have bought or expect to sell on commission. These are generally well selected, from a mercantile point of view, but as well-known names are far more valuable than good pictures, such galleries offer but little chance to merely rising painters.

As regards water-colour drawings the case is very bad. The two water-colour societies are close corporations which exhibit only the works of their members, so that one room of the Royal Academy, a small space at the Suffolk Street and Dudley Galleries, and some few dealers' shops afford the only walls available for the many artists and amateurs who wish to show their drawings to the public.

Now the moral of this melancholy tale is that a great many more respectable pictures come into the world than can be exhibited to it; that want of space leads to selection, that selection leads to mistakes, prejudices, privileges, favouritisms, and consequently to injustices, discouragements, and ruin of deserving men. What is wanted is a fair field and no favour. We believe that this cannot be attained in any gallery where a committee of selection exists; and what we should like to see established is a large exhibition building to which everyone could send his paintings on payment of a small but remunerative rent for the amount of wall-space occupied. This rent together with admission money and commissions on sales should make the undertaking sufficiently profitable. The natural objection to such a scheme is that so many bad pictures would be sent in that no good painter would care to exhibit, and that the public would not come to the gallery. This objection is so serious and well founded that it can only be met—as all the inconveniences of perfect liberty are met—by laws which contradict or limit the general principle laid down. While therefore we protest against the selection of the pictures to be exhibited, we admit that the arrangement of them on the walls must be left to persons competent at least to divide the good from the bad; and in order to prevent valuable space being monopolised by worthless daubs, we would grant to no one the right to keep his picture on the walls for more than a short time—say a fortnight or three weeks—unless by the permission or invitation of the managers of the gallery.

In this way the bad pictures would pass quickly through the exhibition, which should be open all the year round, and the good pictures would either remain as more permanent attractions, or would succeed one another quickly if they obtained a ready sale.

Such a gallery, and only such a gallery, would secure to every painter the means of exhibiting his works without truckling for favour or risking disappointment. It would relieve the Royal Academy from the absurd pressure now put upon it; it would enable the council to reserve their walls, according to the terms of the 'instrument,' to the paintings of artists of distinguished merit, and would put it in their power to exercise those critical functions with which

they are now falsely credited. The open gallery would give them the opportunity of judging of the merits of painters hitherto unknown to them, and they would have a chance of proving by their annual exhibition that they were not only the best painters but also the best critics, and that they had a fair claim to guide the public taste in Art. We believe that under such circumstances the Royal Academy would rise to the occasion, and that its exhibitions would excel any hitherto seen. Without, however, such a filtering gallery as we have suggested it will always be believed that many a good picture 'is born to blush unseen;' and the Royal Academy would best consult its own credit and the interests of art and of artists, either by obtaining space to hang every painting sent to it, or else by becoming a close corporation like the water-colour societies. In its present condition it is 'a delusion and a snare.'

We must repeat once more that no gallery where criticism is allowed to interfere with the admission of any picture can really be accepted as affording justice to all schools of art. New attempts at conveying ideas and facts through painting are constantly being made, old methods are frequently imitated or caricatured. There is generally some good and some evil at the bottom of each of these efforts, but all in their turn are over-praised by one set of critics and denounced by another. How few great artists have been appreciated by the critics when their best pictures were painted; how many who enjoyed a considerable reputation have since sunk to their proper level! The art-critics are as a rule most fallible guides; sometimes obstinate from ignorance, sometimes mad with too much learning, and frequently so anxious to exhibit their own æsthetic faculties and fine writing as practically to ignore the subjects of which they treat. Public opinion is in the long run the safest test of artistic merit. The public must take its time in hearing the evidence and arguments on both sides, but in the end its verdict will be sounder and fairer than that given by any expert. It is to public opinion that the artist must look for lasting fame, and it is to public opinion and not to councils and cliques that we wish him to have the opportunity of appealing.

T. VILLIERS LISTER.

A CENSUS OF RELIGIONS.

‘WHETHER we regard a people merely in their secular capacity, as partners in a great association for promoting the stability, the opulence, the peaceful glory of a state; or view them in their loftier character as subjects of a higher kingdom—swift and momentary travellers towards a never-ending destiny; in either aspect the degree and the direction of religious sentiment in a community are subjects of the weightiest import—in the one case to the temporal guardians of a nation—to its spiritual teachers in the other. Statesmen—aware to what a great extent the liberty or bondage, industry or indolence, prosperity or poverty of any people, are the fruits of its religious creed, and knowing also how extensively religious feelings tinge political opinions—find an accurate acquaintance with the various degrees and forms in which religious sentiment is manifested indispensable to a correct appreciation either of the country’s actual condition or of its prospective tendency, and equally essential to enable them to legislate with safety upon questions where religious principles or prejudices are inextricably involved.’

A more appropriate introduction to our subject will not easily be found than the above extract from the second page of Mr. Horace Mann’s *Report* to the Registrar-General upon the accommodation for religious worship in 1851. Having read it, it is hard to conceive that any question should be raised as to the principle involved, or as to the expediency of adopting the most direct and efficient means for obtaining the desired information upon the religion of the nation.

In our neglect of a Religious Census we stand nearly, if not quite, alone amidst civilised nations. England is unfavourably distinguished, not only from foreign countries, but from an important portion of the United Kingdom. Ireland has a Religious Census—why should England be deprived of the advantage which a knowledge of the religion of the people brings to their good government? The Irish Census Act provides that an account in writing be taken of the *religious profession* of every person; but this item of information is omitted from the list of requisites to be answered in the English schedule.

Why is the system pursued on this side of the Irish Channel

different from that pursued on the other? The importance of the question has only come into prominence within the last thirty years, and its investigation need not therefore carry our retrospect beyond that period.

The Census Bill of 1850 gave the Secretary of State power to issue questions referring, not alone to the numbers, ages, and occupations of the people, but also to such 'further particulars' as might seem to him advisable, and the Registrar-General was disposed to adopt as an interpretation of 'further particulars' the collection of intelligence as to the 'number, varieties, and capabilities' of the religious and scholastic institutions of the country. The House of Peers, however, raised an objection to the proposed inquiry in connection with the penal sections of the Act, and the objection being confirmed by the law officers of the Crown, the proposed extension of the inquiry under statutory obligation was relinquished.

It was intended that the deficiencies of the Census Act of 1850 should be supplied in the Census Act of 1860, and the Bill was accordingly presented to the House of Commons with a provision for obtaining the *religious profession*, as well as the age, sex, and occupation of every individual. This provision was opposed by the Non-conformists, and its omission was moved by Mr. Edward Baines, the respected member for Leeds, in a speech embodying all the arguments that ingenuity and imagination could suggest. He was answered by Sir George C. Lewis, the then Home Secretary. Sir George began by showing that all presumptions were in favour of a Religious Census—an accessory and assistance to good government which had found place in the general practice of civilised states; and he gave reasons for believing that the difficulties which were apprehended would disappear in the face of a well-organised system of enumeration. Sir George Lewis, with a warmth unusual in him, contemptuously spurned the insinuation that the Religious Census would be perverted into a means of oppression through undue influence; he reproved the inconsistency with which the several sects protested against the record of their religious profession in the national census, while their very protests were made with an ostentatious display of their nonconformity; but he concluded by withdrawing the provision for the record of a Religious Profession. The same subserviency to Dissent was exhibited by the Government in 1870. The introduction of a return of Religious Professions into the Census Bill of 1870 was again opposed by Mr. Baines, and Lord Palmerston surrendered to the political pressure of the Dissenters in these words: 'We have deferred to their feelings, but we cannot assent to their reasons.' The House of Lords subsequently inserted a provision for taking a Census of Religions, but the clause was struck out by the Commons before they passed the Bill at the close of the Session on the 8th of August. There was little reason to expect that the Census

Bill of 1880 would require a return of religious professions. The Liberation Society had issued its prohibition, and the Government of Mr. Gladstone were too considerate for the wishes of their Nonconformist friends to offend them by a discovery of truths vitally connected with the science of legislation, but dreaded for their exposure of statistical delusions. The Census Bills which (had they been earlier laid before the Commons would have provoked discussion) were prudently kept back till the last days of the Session, and the brief debate which then ensued was on the side of the Government confined to the assertion of two most inadequate objections to a Religious Census.

First, that the expense of the census would be increased. Secondly, that the publication of the census would be delayed. To the first objection it may be replied that the cost of an additional column to the form of return, and the consequent labour of filling it up, would be infinitesimally small compared with the whole cost of the census, and not for a moment to be weighed against the national utility of the information it would convey. To the second, the reply would be that a decennial census is not like a weather forecast, whose virtue vanishes with every hour of delay in its publication, and that assuming the very problematical result of an appreciable delay, that delay would not impair the utility of the return for any practical purpose.

The complete indictment of a Religious Census is conspicuously set forth in the *Nonconformist* of the 29th of July, 1880, which reprints what it describes 'as the excellent epitome of objections published in a separate form by the Liberation Society.' This document, important as expressing the principles, convictions, and arguments of the Liberation Society, of the eminent Nonconformists who are members of the House of Commons, and of their ably conducted journal, shall be given *in extenso*.

OBJECTIONS TO A CENSUS OF RELIGIOUS PROFESSION.

1. *The inquiry is unwarrantable.* What right have Government officials to question us about our religious, any more than about our political professions? The only place where they can be legitimately elicited is in the polling booth.

2. *The inquiry is absurd, or unreasonable.* How can every hotel-keeper, every lodging-house keeper, every master, and every head of a hospital, or prison, or poor-house, make a truthful return of the religious profession of 'every living person' who happens to have slept under a certain roof on a particular night? The inquiry would in many cases be resented as an impertinence, and if the facts were guessed at, instead of ascertained, they would frequently be, not facts, but fictions. It would be unjust to householders and inmates alike.

3. *The result would be misleading, because of the ambiguity of the inquiry.* What is 'religious profession'? Is it what a man believes, or only what he professes, or what he says that he professes? Or if it means, what religious body does he belong to, what is belonging to a religious body? Then there are many persons who cannot really define their religious profession, and why should they be obliged to attempt to do so, or be punished if they refuse to make the attempt?

4. *The return would be incomplete*, because it is well known that a large number of persons would, on conscientious grounds, feel bound to refuse the information sought for, and many would refuse on other grounds. And if the enumerators attempted to supply it, they would inevitably blunder.

5. *The return would prove fallacious and grossly misleading*. Large masses of the people make no religious profession; but, because they will not like to acknowledge the fact, they will reply, 'Church of England.' The effect would be to produce the impression that the Church of England has a far greater body of adherents than all the other religious bodies have, and that is the object of the suggested *Religious Census*. It is wished to use what would be really inaccurate, and in many cases dishonest returns, for a political purpose.

6. *The inquiry would lead to coercion and sectarian rivalry, and would occasion great bitterness of feeling*. Many of the Established clergy and their adherents would use all their influence to induce their dependents and the poor to return themselves as Churchmen, and numbers of persons would be too ignorant or too weak to resist such pressure.

7. *The inquiry would be contrary to the true purpose of a census*. That purpose is to obtain statistics which are likely to be accurate, and to ascertain facts which can be verified, and not opinions or professions which are necessarily vague and ambiguous, or unascertainable. A census of the population ought to be taken with the good will of the population: whereas such a Religious Census as is suggested would excite anger and resistance, and make the census odious to a large class of the people.

And now what are these objections worth? They shall be answered *seriatim*.

1. A government is warranted in requiring for the public advantage information which it may be irksome for individuals to give; but since a declaration of religious profession would necessarily be voluntary and uncontroverted, it could not involve any infringement of conscientious scruple.

2. Every householder could ask, and every adult inmate of every tenement could reply to, the question which concerns his religious profession. Parents would be responsible for their children.

3. The object of the inquiry is to ascertain every man's account of his religious profession if he has any. It is impossible to believe that men would wantonly and aimlessly misrepresent their profession, and still more to imagine that either intentional or casual errors could be so many as to affect the essential purpose of the inquiry.

4. A refusal on conscientious or capricious grounds to answer the inquiry might leave the return incomplete numerically as regards the entire population, but complete and exact as an exposition of the relative proportions of the several denominations.

5. If masses of the people choose to describe their religious profession as that of the Church of England, it would be the height of tyranny to preclude their doing so. The objection foretells 'that the effect (of the inquiry) would be to produce an impression that the Church of England has a far greater body of adherents than all the other bodies have.' The prophecy is probably correct, and we have it here confessed that the objection of the Liberation Society to a

Religious Census is that it would enable the majority of the English to declare themselves members of the Church of England.

6. Coercion, it is insinuated, can be exercised only by the clergy and their adherents; and, on the other hand, only the Dissenting poor are described as so weak and ignorant as to succumb to the influence which would be exercised to make them appear Churchmen. Instead of imagining this double slander, it would be wiser and truer to believe that Churchmen respect the convictions of those whom they employ, and that Englishmen, whether Churchmen or Dissenters, would scorn to dissemble their religious belief.

7. Certainly a census should be taken with the good will of the population, and so it *would* be if they knew that its object was—not such as it is represented by the Liberation Society—but one aiming at the more just, more tolerant, more religious government of the whole nation. The Liberation Society allege, indeed, that although they have strenuously and successfully opposed a ‘Religious Profession’ Census, they are heartily in favour of the ‘fullest and fairest Religious Census’ in a repetition of that taken in 1851. Well, let us inquire into the so-called Religious Census of 1851.

When Sir Morton Peto brought forward his Burials Bill in 1861, he announced that he proposed that measure in the name of the majority of the English people. Challenged for his authority, he referred to the Religious Census of 1851. The book which he so designated is really entitled ‘Census of Great Britain, 1851, Religious Worship,’ and in a note prefixed to the Report, Mr. Graham, the Registrar-General, addresses the Secretary of State for the Home Department thus: ‘My Lord,—When the census of Great Britain was taken in 1851, I received instructions from Her Majesty’s Government to endeavour to procure information as to the existing accommodation for public religious worship.’ Sir George Cornwall Lewis, the then Home Secretary, readily assented to a motion by a member of the House for a copy of the ‘instructions’ referred to by the Registrar-General; but after some delay he informed his querist that ‘no copy of the instructions could be produced, for that no such instructions existed.’ Mr. Graham could not of course have written as he did without some warrant, and the probability is that although no parliamentary authority had been given, yet that Lord Palmerston had verbally assented to the suggestion of his zealous subordinate. The ability with which Mr. Horace Mann performed the laborious task confided to him by the Registrar-General has never been doubted, but his report upon ‘Religious Worship’ is destitute of parliamentary sanction, and cannot be quoted as having official authority: its accuracy has been impugned, but it would be unreasonable to impute to dishonesty in the compiler, errors attributable to deceitful materials.

Apart from any question as to Mr. Mann’s use of the returns

furnished to him, it is important carefully to scrutinize the nature of those returns, and the conclusions drawn from them for an object quite distinct from the purpose of the inquiry.

Mr. Mann's statistics profess to present returns of the number of churches and chapels, the number of sittings provided, and the number of attendants at public worship, on the Census Sunday, viz. :—

Accommodation for Worship.

	Buildings	Seats
Church of England	14,077	5,317,915
Nonconformist	20,300	4,894,048

Attendance at Worship (supplying by estimate defects in the Returns).

	Morning	Afternoon	Evening
Church of England	2,541,244	1,890,764	800,543
Nonconformists	2,106,298	1,293,371	2,203,906
	4,647,482	3,184,135	3,004,449

By assuming that, of the afternoon attendants, one half, and of the evening attendants, one third, had not been at the morning service, Mr. Mann obtains a total of

Worshippers in the Church of England	3,773,474
Worshippers of other denominations	3,487,558

or in the proportion of fifty-two Churchmen to forty-eight Nonconformists. Upon these doubtful data the Liberation Society constructed their computations, eventuating in the discovery that Nonconformists constituted a majority of the people of England and Wales. To reach this result, some efforts of imagination became necessary. (1) The relative number of the adherents of the several denominations worshipping on a particular day was to be applicable as a scale for determining the denomination of all the rest of the population. (2) The asserted increase of Nonconformist chapels prior to 1851 was to be continuous subsequent to 1851.

(1) This assumption demands most careful scrutiny, seeing that Mr. Mann's figures include only 7,261,032, and that the population was 18,000,000. How are the ten millions and more, who were not at church or chapel on Census Sunday, to be dealt with? Are they to be scored off as of no religion, or be apportioned by the simple operation of a rule-of-three amongst the one hundred and odd denominations tabulated by Mr. Mann? Neither course would be satisfactory. There must be many thousands of those who did not worship publicly on Census Sunday who would still be quite prepared to declare their religious profession; while, again, an arithmetical distribution of the non-worshippers would yield a most fallacious impression of the convictions or preferences personally entertained.

Nonconformity, or separation from the Church, is in its origin an

evidence of spiritual activity, and its existence is for the most part accompanied by earnestness and resolution in the discharge of religious duties. When men become separatists from the denomination of which they had been members, they are, by the very freshness of their engagements, inspired with zeal and perseverance for their punctual fulfilment; and thus, as a rule, the newer the sect, the larger will be the proportion of its members attending its public services. The Wesleyans, as one of the newest and most vigorous denominations, would naturally have been represented at their services on Census Sunday in larger proportions than the Established Church. Mr. Voysey's followers, to take a very novel sect, might almost all be worshipping in Langham Hall, but it would be unwarrantable to assume that for every seven persons counted there, eleven others elsewhere would own him as their pastor.

(2) The Liberation Society affirm that Nonconformity, in the number of its places of worship and its worshippers, has grown much faster than the Church since 1851. No authentic information exists which can justify this conclusion, but such as it has offered may advantageously be considered. Mr. H. Mann extended his inquiry retrospectively from 1851 to the commencement of the century, but the data at his command were imperfect and unreliable, and he frankly offers the results with serious misgiving. The Nonconformists, however, pursued a mode of computation so flattering to their own progress, and instituted in the years 1872, 1873, through their own agents, an inquiry, embracing, it is true, only some 141 towns, but establishing upon the statistics thus obtained, as to both church and chapel, a result, out of 100 sittings, of 41·2 provided by the Church, and of 58·8 provided by Nonconformists—the numerical increase of sittings being, for the Church, 293,493; for Nonconformists, 621,699; and upon the strength of this statement Nonconformists assert that 'there is ample ground for concluding that the Established Church of England and Wales is now the Church of a decided minority of the population.'

The information on which this momentous declaration is hazarded has been often found so gravely inaccurate, that no confidence can be placed on the conclusions to which it leads; the individual details are beyond the reach of private investigation, but the conclusions can be dealt with upon independent, but thoroughly authentic evidence.

In 1851 Mr. Mann estimated the accommodation for religious worship to be:—

	Buildings	Sittings
Church of England	14,077	5,317,915
Other denominations	20,390	4,804,648

The yearly accession of Dissenting chapels to the registered list may be counted by hundreds. In 1875 it was 534, in 1876 it was 543. How is it, therefore, that the number from time to time is

widely fluctuating, and that in the register, on 31st of December 1878, it is only 19,977? The explanation is to be found in the circumstance that Dissenters' chapels have no permanent character. Being unconsecrated and unassociated with any religious sentiment, the bulk of them can be treated as interest and convenience dictate. They may be diverted to purely secular uses, or their temporary hire for religious worship may be discontinued. Of Nonconformist chapels there were—

Registered on the 1st of January 1875	19,946
The additions registered in 1875 were	534
" " " 1876 "	543

Which would have raised the number on the 1st January 1877 to 21,023

But that the expurgation of the register which takes place
from time to time led to the excision in 1876 of . . . 1,959

Leaving an effective total of 19,004

or 1,326 less than the number stated by Mr. Mann, and adopted by the Liberation Society in 1851. Which solution of this discrepancy is to be accepted?

(1) Must Mr. Mann's estimate be admitted to be an exaggeration, and so discrediting all the statistical computations founded on it? or (2) Must the Registrar-General's report of 1877 force upon us the conviction that Nonconformity as exhibited in the number of its places of worship has decreased since 1851?

The obscurity attending the consideration of these questions can be materially dissipated by a study of the 'List of Places of Meeting for Religious Worship' certified to the Registrar-General, and on the Register of the 31st of March, 1876.' The total remaining on the Register is given at 18,723, and as the number of chapels once registered exceeds 22,750, it follows that more than 4,000 must have been struck off at various revisions. Nor is it wonderful that this necessity should have arisen, when the character of the buildings registered for religious services is scrutinised, including as they do: 'School-rooms,' 'music-halls,' 'amphitheatres,' 'vestries,' 'temperance halls,' 'occupied houses,' 'rooms in a house,' 'cottages,' 'club-rooms,' 'railway arches,' 'bakehouses,' 'malt-kilns,' 'town-halls,' &c., &c. A selection from the list itself will faithfully illustrate the varied and ephemeral nature of these 'places of public worship.' The page of the Blue Book is prefixed to the description of the certified meeting-place.

Page

8. A dwelling-house in the occupation of John Poor, labourer, Old Park, near Bramdean.

16. A room in a house belonging to Mr. R. S. Boyt (Uxbridge), Subscription Reading-Room, Lyme Regis.

23. Loft belonging to Robert Roe, Lynton.

24. Primitive Methodist preaching-room, owned by Henry Nuttall, Esq. (Barkby).

Page

27. 'The Room' in the occupation of Henry George Childs (Milbury Osmond).
 30. Club-room, Pelican Inn, New Town, Ebbw Vale.
 33. Nos. 75 and 76 Railway Arches, under the Eastern Counties Railway, North Street, Bethnal Green.
 Amicable Hall.
 Christian Community Memorial Hall.
 People's Hall.
 Albion Grammar School.
 42. Great and Little Bolton Co-operative Hall.
 44. Boston Sunday School Union School-room.
 46. Hall of Freedom.
 52. A dwelling known by the name of Benjamin Wilkins's Dwelling-House, Chilton Polden.
 54. People's Hall.
 Assembly Rooms.
 Bethel Arch.
 Royal British Schools.
 56. Assembly Rooms, Fox and Goose Inn, Redditch.
 62. Girls' British School in the rear of the Church.
 68. Bakehouse attached to the dwelling-house of Mr. Jacob Crabb.
 100. Noah's Ark.
 124. New Public Hall, Godalming.
 133. Mr. Tanner's Lecture Room, Bohemia Mews, Hastings.
 143. Royal Amphitheatre, 85 High Holborn.
 Doughty Hall, 14 Bedford Row.
 Claremont Hall, Penton Street, Islington, a hall owned by Mr. John Stabb.
 166. Gladstone Music Hall (Leicester).
 184. Buildings in the occupation of Hezekiah Kitchmaid.
 233. Black Horse Inn Long Room, Reading.
 Foresters' Assembly Rooms, Reading.
 243. Co-operative Assembly Rooms, Delph.
 A wooden movable building owned by Mr. Edwin Austen, farmer (Little Bride, Rye, Kent).
 245. Justice Room, back of the Porcupine Inn, Tywordoeath.
 248. The Great Hall of Freemasons' Tavern, London.
 Royal Music Hall, Holborn, London.
 249. The Ark, Victoria Rooms.
 350. A Railway Arch, Walworth.
 Ten buildings in the occupation of Joseph Floyd at Mirfield, Ossett, Thornhill Lees, Ossett Common, Gawthorpe, Chickenley, Whitley, Thornhill, Briestfield, Batley Carr, all in Dewsbury Union.

These extracts suffice to indicate how widely consecrated churches are distinguished by their immutability from the registered buildings, and how impossible it is to construct from numbers alone any comparison of the position and progress of the Church and of Dissenters.

As regards the mere fabrics, the cost of the national churches far exceeds that of Dissenting chapels, although of late, as regards these last, a great advance must have been observed in their solidity, their constructional excellence, and their architectural propriety. 'Steeple-houses' is no longer the nickname of National churches, and the most

rigid ecclesiologist might be satisfied with the externals, at all events, of many a Nonconformist chapel. The contrast between the conditions on which the National churches and Nonconformist buildings are respectively constituted and utilised is very striking. A consecrated church must be free from debt, it must, under certain Acts, be endowed with 5,000*l.*, and the property must be permanently vested in the Ecclesiastical Commissioners. A Dissenting chapel may be built with borrowed money, and be mortgaged for its full value; it may be hired for purposes of worship exclusively, or for worship alternately with any other purposes, however secular or profane. The economy of this community of use is obvious, and no less is the vantage ground which it provides for the display of Nonconformist statistics. A church with 1,000 seats may have cost 10,000*l.*, and the endowment raises the outlay to 15,000*l.*, but a lecture-room or dancing-saloon with the same capacity may be hired for the whole or part of Sunday, and besides the rent, the only condition needful to ensure its registration is a fee of 2*s.* 6*d.*

The Sunday rent of the Islington Agricultural Hall would be trivial compared with its capacity, but what a masterly stroke of policy to balance by a fee of half-a-crown the vast area of the Agricultural Hall registered as 'a place of meeting for public worship' against the spacious and solemn nave of St. Paul's Cathedral.

Although the fee for registering a meeting-house for worship is only 2*s.* 6*d.*, its registration as licensed for the celebration of marriage costs 3*l.* Of chapels now licensed for marriages there are 8,413, including probably the more important and durable buildings, so that there are more than 10,000 for which this privilege of performing marriages has not been provided. Such are the characteristics of the so-called 'Religious Census' of 1851, a repetition of which the Nonconformists anxiously desire.

Nonconformists invite us, indeed, in an apologetic strain to admit that imperfect as the inquiry of 1851 may be, 'it is still to be accepted as the best system attainable.' Churchmen distinctly decline this admission, and they point to the 'personal religious profession' as the only honest, truthful, accurate mode of attaining the desired end. The opportunity for that really effective inquiry unfortunately cannot recur for another ten years, but it is quite possible to adduce evidence official and unimpeachable, which, although indirect, is quite appropriate.

We turn for a part of our denominational statistics to the year 1870. Owing to the subsequent fusion of denominations in School Boards, that is the latest date at which would be found official returns of the religious classification of the children attending primary schools. In the year 1870, according to the Report of the Education Department, there were under inspection in primary schools 1,434,765 children, of whom 72·6 per 100 were in Church schools.

Of 190,054 marriages in 1878,¹ 72·6 per 100 were of the Church.

Of 32,361 seamen and mariners employed in 1875, the percentage of Churchmen was 75·5.²

The army of 183,024 men, having in 1870 as many as 24·0 per 100 Roman Catholics, still showed a proportion of Churchmen equal to 62·5 per cent.³

Of 101,458 adult inmates of workhouses in 1875, the proportion of Church people was 79 per cent.⁴

Of 22,677 prisoners in gaol in 1867, the proportion returned as Churchmen was 75 per 100.⁵

The number of Nonconformist chapels supplied to Mr. Mann contrasts strangely with the number of 'Ministers' recorded in the enumerated Professions of the Official Census of 1851. In that Report the Clergy of the Church are stated at 17,320, and the Ministers of all other denominations at 8,658.

One expects to find some proportion between the number of the shepherds and the number of the folds into which they gather their sheep; but while the Clergy considerably exceeded in number the churches in which they officiated, Nonconformist ministers of all sects do not in number equal one half of the buildings for worship which are said to have been provided for them and are appealed to as an evidence of progress.

The official statistics quoted above challenge attention, not by their numerical magnitude, but by their authenticity and their appositeness as a reliable test within the respective spheres of observation, and the very diversity of their origin strengthens the conclusion that a genuine Census of Religions would record about one fourth of the people of England and Wales as alien from the National Church.

Some of these statements, when referred to in the House of Commons, provoked a very amusing commentary from Mr. Bright.

Mr. Bright had been assuming, as usual, that Nonconformity could claim more than half the people of England, and when checked by a reference to these returns, including those from gaols and workhouses, he rejoined: 'Oh, I do not deny that the great majority in gaols and workhouses are members of the Established Church.' The reply was ready, clever, and telling, and it came with especial appropriateness from Mr. Bright, whose pre-eminently respectable 'Society of Friends' would probably not find a 'Quaker' in either gaol or workhouse, for the best of all reasons—an erring Friend would have been excommunicated before he could reach either of those destinations. With an admirable charity, the 'Society of Friends' supports its members when impoverished through misfortune, and with inflexible discipline it pronounces the expulsion of those who 'walk

¹ Registrar-General's 41st Report.

² P. 132, September, 1876.

³ P. 170, September, 1871.

⁴ P. 257, September, 1876.

⁵ P. 284, September, 1868.

disorderly' long before the Friend becomes a criminal. Accidents, however, will happen in the best societies, and there is on record one instance of a Quaker being hanged for murder.

But how does Mr. Bright's pleasantry leave the question as a serious consideration for statesmen? Can the millions of non-worshippers on Census Sunday be ignored in legislation? Have they no rights, no claims upon the State, upon the Church, upon their fellow-countrymen of all denominations? These claims may be disregarded by some of the sects; they certainly are not by all; they certainly are not by the Church; and assuredly the people's right to declare their own religious profession is one which ought to be respected. How can it best be ascertained? By arbitrary inferences? from statements unauthorised in their origin, and irrelevant in their character? or by the simple process of giving to every man the opportunity of declaring voluntarily the denomination to which he belongs? That such a personal profession must be voluntary is obvious, for there can be no means of enforcing it, and any but a spontaneous profession would be worse than useless. As much or more than any other inquiry, that of religious profession should be free and truthful, and the character of the census is perverted when its results can be presented only as statistics of devotions. What, then, are the opposing views of Churchmen and Nonconformists touching a Religious Census. The Liberation Society shall explain their own. In their epitome already quoted, they say, 'The effect would be to produce the impression that the Church of England has a far greater body of adherents than all the other religious bodies have, and *that is the object of the suggested Religious Census*. It is wished to use what would really be inaccurate, and, in many cases, dishonest returns, for a political purpose.'

The general objects of a Religious Census in the view of Churchmen are clearly stated in the passage from Mr. Mann's Report prefixed to this paper. *Political purpose they have none*. Religious liberty with Churchmen of the present day is not a phrase, and they contend that, whether Nonconformists were proved by a Religious Census to be fewer than a quarter, or more than half the population, they are equally entitled to the fullest measure of liberty of conscience, liberty of worship, and to personal equality before the law. Churchmen cherish no enmity and design no injury to Dissenters, but they would seriously deprecate and resolutely oppose political movements tending to damnify the national religion. The immediate and direct purpose of Churchmen in asking for a true Religious Census was undoubtedly to demolish by positive evidence the delusive statistics unwarrantably grafted upon Mr. Mann's report. Independently of a love of truth and thirst for knowledge, they wished to arrest the mischief which has been elaborated from that greatly misused publication. The capricious manipulation of Mr. Mann's

figures would have been harmless enough, had they not led (borrowing the phrase from the *Liberator*) 'to inaccurate returns used for a political purpose,' and the fabrication of deceptive computations to the detriment of the Church. Ever since 1860 Burials Bills have been presented to the House of Commons as measures promoted in the interest of a Nonconformist majority of the people of England, and every legislative measure bearing on the national religion has been offered for discussion under the same false colours. State departments, and the commissions connected with them, exhibited the effects of this sinister prepossession, especially conspicuous in the proceedings of the Education Department, the Charity Commissioners, and the Endowed Schools Commission. The operation of this sentiment is aptly illustrated by a letter to the *Times* of the 15th of May, 1875, from Mr. Roby, the able Secretary and inspiring genius of the Endowed Schools Commission. Mr. Roby, writing in disapproval of the scheme proposed for Crewkerne Grammar School, 'protests against ticketing national institutions with the symbols of what is now the faith of only half the nation.'

If statesmen and influential officials like Mr. Roby can imagine the nationality of the Church of England to depend upon her outnumbering 150 sects, it is not surprising that the Liberation Society, in the name of the more aggressive of those sects, should strain every nerve to exhibit a preponderance of numbers adverse to the Church; for on their success in obtaining a general belief in that assumption depends, as they think, their crowning victory in the disestablishment and disendowment of the Church.

This is not the place for discussing the conditions which would eventuate in disestablishment, but it may be easily shown that disestablishment can be no necessary result of a nice numerical comparison between Churchmen and the aggregation of dissentients. If any one of the sects attained a larger following than the Church, it might, by a general consensus, supersede it as the expression of the religious profession of the country, and take its place in the Constitution; but short of such transposition, the perpetuation of the Monarchy involves the perpetuation of the National Church, with which it has been welded by statute with the special object of 'securing our religion, laws, and liberties.'

Disestablishment, the indispensable precursor of 'religious equality' (a phrase which, if it differs in meaning from 'religious liberty,' means 'equality of religions'), may or may not enter into the category of the practical subjects of the day; but a course of policy injurious to the National Church, to its rights of property, and to its religious liberty, has been pursued for some years, prompted and promoted by the allegation 'that the Church, being outnumbered by the sects, was no longer the National Church.'

The allegation that a majority of the people were strange to the

Church would not, even if true, justify the purpose to which it was applied; but being wholly destitute of proof, it has, nevertheless, been allowed to vitiate legislation and prejudice the administration of the law in matters which concerned religion and education.

The 'irrevocable past' stands but too frequently pointing to opportunities neglected, and to years which in their recurrent cycles offered again and again a power of doing wisely and justly, to be again and again misused. Another decade must pass before a truer liberality on the part of those who profess to be Liberals, or greater courage and independence of party in the Government of the day, permits the realisation of a Religious Census for England. In the interval it cannot be unreasonable to express a hope that the Queen's Ministers (whoever they may be) will no longer permit the laws of England to be moulded and administered under the influence of a gross misrepresentation of the religious profession of the people.

J. G. HUBBARD.

PENNY FICTION.

It is now nearly a quarter of a century ago since a popular novelist revealed to the world in a well-known periodical the existence of the 'Unknown Public,' and a very curious revelation it was. He showed us that the few thousands of persons who had hitherto imagined themselves to be the public—so far, at least, as their being the arbiters of popularity in respect to writers of fiction was concerned—were in fact nothing of the kind; that the subscribers to the circulating libraries, the members of book clubs, the purchasers of magazines and railway novels, might indeed have their favourites, but that these last were 'nowhere,' as respected the number of their backers, in comparison with novelists whose names and works appear in penny journals and nowhere else.

This class of literature was of considerable dimensions even in the days when Mr. Wilkie Collins first called attention to it; but the luxuriance of its growth has since become tropical. His observations are drawn from some half a dozen specimens of it only, whereas I now hold in my hand—or rather in both hands—nearly half a hundred of them. The population of readers must be dense indeed in more than one sense that can support such a crop.

Doubtless the individual circulation of none of these serials is equal to that of the most successful of them at the date of their first discovery; but those who read them must, from various causes, of which the most obvious is the least important, have trebled in number. Population, that is to say, has increased in very small proportion as compared with the increase of those who very literally run and read—the peripatetic students, who study on their way to work or even as they work, including, I am sorry to say, the telegraph boy on his errand.

Nevertheless, notwithstanding its gigantic dimensions, the Unknown Public remains practically as unknown as ever. The literary wares that find such favour with it do not meet the eye of the ordinary observer. They are to be found neither at the bookseller's, nor on the railway stall. But in back streets, in small dark shops, in the company of cheap tobacco, hardbake (and, at the proper season,

valentines), their leaves lie thick as those in Vallombrosa. Early in the week is their springtime, when they are put forth from Heaven knows what printing-houses in courts and alleys, to lie for a few days only on the counter in huge piles. On Saturdays, albeit that is their nominal publishing day, they have for the most part disappeared. For this sort of literature has one decidedly advanced feature, and possesses one virtue of endurance—it comes out ever so long before the date it bears upon its title page, and ‘when the world shall have passed away’ will, by a few days at least, if faith is to be placed in figures, survive it.

Why it should have any date at all no man can tell. There is nothing in the contents that is peculiar to one year—or, to say truth, of one era—rather than another. As a rule, indeed, time and space are alike annihilated in them, in order to make two lovers happy. The general terms in which they are written is one of their peculiar features. One would think that, instead of being as unlike real life as stories professing to deal with it can be, they were photographs of it, and that the writers, as in the following instance, had always the fear of the law of libel before their eyes:—

We must now request our readers to accompany us into an obscure *cul de sac* opening into a narrow street branching off Holborn. For many reasons we do not choose to be more precise as to locality.

Of course in this *cul de sac* is a Private Inquiry Office, with a detective in it. But in defining even him the novelist gives himself no trouble to arouse excitement in his readers: they have paid their penny for the history of this interesting person, and, that being done, they may read about him or not, as they please. One would really think that the author of the story was also the proprietor of the periodical.

Those who desire (he says) to make the acquaintance of this somewhat remarkable person have only to step with us into the little dusky room where he is seated and we shall have much pleasure in introducing him to their notice.

—A sentence which has certainly the air of saying, ‘You may be introduced to him or you may let it alone.’

The coolness with which everything is said and done in penny fiction is indeed most remarkable, and should greatly recommend it to that respectable class who have a horror of ‘sensation.’ In a story, for example, that purports to describe University life (and is as much like it as the camel produced from the German professor’s self-consciousness must have been to a real camel) there is an underplot of an amazing kind. The wicked undergraduate, notwithstanding that he has the advantage of being a baronet, is foiled in his attempt to win the affections of a young woman in humble life, and the virtuous hero of the story recommends her to the consideration of his negro servant:—

'Talk to her, Monday,' whispered Jack, 'and see if she loves you.'

For a short time Monday and Ada were in close conversation.

• Then Monday uttered a cry like a war-whoop.

'It am come all right, sare. Missy Ada says she ~~not~~ really care for Sir Sydney, and she will be my little wife,' he said.

'I congratulate you, Monday,' answered Jack.

In half an hour more they arrived at the house of John Radford, plumber and glazier, who was Ada's father.

Mr. and Mrs. Radford and their two sons received their daughter and her companions with that unstudied civility which contrasts so favourably with the stuck-up ceremony of many in a higher position. They were not prejudiced against Monday on account of his dark skin.

It was enough for them that he was the man of Ada's choice.

Mrs. Radford even went so far as to say, 'Well, for a coloured gentleman, he is very handsome and quite nice mannered, though I think Ada's been a little sly in telling us nothing about her engagement to the last.'

They did not know all.

Nor was it advisable that they should.

Still they knew something—for example, that their new son-in-law was a black man, which one would have thought might have struck them as phenomenal. They take it, however, quite quietly and as a matter of course. Now, surely, even among plumbers and glaziers, it must be thought as strange for one's daughter to marry a black man as a lord. Yet, out of this dramatic situation the author makes nothing at all, but treats it as coolly as his *dramatis personæ* do themselves. Now *my* notion would have been to make the bridegroom a black lord, and then to portray, with admirable skill, the conflicting emotions of his mother-in-law, disgusted on the one hand by his colour, attracted on the other by his rank. But 'sensation' is evidently out of the line of the penny novelist: he gives his facts, which are certainly remarkable, then leaves both his characters and his readers to draw their own conclusions.

The total absence of local scenery from these half hundred romances is also curious, and becomes so very marked when the novelists are so imprudent as to take their *dramatis personæ* out of England, that one can't help wondering whether these gentlemen have ever been in foreign parts themselves, or even read about them. Here is the conclusion of a romance which leaves nothing to be desired in the way of brevity, but is unquestionably a little abrupt and vague:—

A year has passed away, and we are far from England and the English climate.

Whither 'we' have gone the author does not say, nor even indicate the hemisphere. It will be imagined perhaps that we shall find out where we are by the indication of the flora and fauna.

A lady and gentleman before the dawn of day have been climbing up an arid road in the direction of a dark ridge.

Observe, again, the ingenious vagueness of the description: an 'arid road' which may mean Siberia, and a 'dark ridge' which may mean the Himalayas.

The dawn suddenly comes upon them in all its glory. Birds twittered in their willow gorges, and it was a very glorious day. Arthur and Emily had passed the night at the ranche, and he had now taken her up to look at the mine which at all events had introduced them. He had previously taken her to see his mother's grave, the mother whom he had so loved. The mine after some delay proved more prosperous than ever. It was not sold, but is the 'appanage' of the younger sons of the house of Dacres.

With the exception of the 'ranche,' it will be remarked that there is not one word in the foregoing description to fix locality. The mine and the ranche together seem indeed to suggest South America. But—I ask for information—do birds twitter there in willow gorges? Younger sons of noble families proverbially come off second best in this country, but if one of them found his only 'appanage' was a mine, he would surely with some justice make a remonstrance.

The readers of this class of fiction will not have Dumas at any price—or, at all events, not at a penny. Mr. Collins tells us how *Monte Christo* was once spread before them, and how they turned from that gorgeous feast with indifference, and fell back upon their tripe and onions—their nameless authors. But some of those who write for them have adopted one peculiarity of Dumas. The short jerky sentences which disfigure the *Three Musketeers*, and indeed all that great novelist's works, are very frequent with them, which induces me to believe that they are paid by the line.

On the other hand, some affect fashionable description and conversation which are drawn out in 'passages that lead to nothing' of an amazing length.

'Where have I been,' replied Clyde with a carelessness which was half forced. 'Oh, I have been over to Higham to see the dame.'

'Ab, yee,' said Sir Edward, 'and how is the poor old creature?'

'Quite well,' said Clyde as he sat down and took up the menu of the elaborate dinner. 'Quite well, she sent her best respects,' he added, but he said nothing of the lodger, pretty Miss Mary Westlake.

And when, a moment afterwards, the door opened and Grace came flowing in with her lithe noiseless step, dressed in one of Worth's masterpieces, a wonder of amber, satin, and antique lace, he raised his eyes and looked at her with an earnest scrutiny—so earnest that she paused with her hand on his chair, and met his eyes with a questioning glance.

'Do you like my new dress?' she said with a calm smile.

'Your dress?' he said. 'Yes, yes, it is very pretty, very.' But to himself he added, 'Yes, they are alike, strangely alike.'

Which last remark may be applied with justice to the conversations of all our novelists. There appears no necessity for their commencement, no reason for their continuance, no object in their conclusion; the reader finds himself in a forest of verbiage from which

he is extricated only at the end of the chapter, which is always, however, 'to be continued.'

It is true that these story-tellers for the million generally keep 'a gallop for the avenue' (an incident of a more or less exciting kind to finish up with), but it is so brief and unsatisfactory that it hardly rises to a canter; the author never seems to get into his stride. The following is a fair example:—

But before we let the curtain fall, we must glance for one moment at another picture, a sad and painful one. In one of those retreats, worse than a living tomb, where reside those whose reason is dead, though their bodies still live, is a small spare cell. The sole occupant is a woman, young and very beautiful. Sometimes she is quiet and gentle as a child; sometimes her fits of phrenzy are frightful to witness; but the only word she utters is *Revenge*, and on her hand she always wears a plain gold band with a cross of black pearls.

This conclusion, which I chanced upon before I read the tale which preceded it, naturally interested me immensely. Here, thought I, is at last an exciting story; I shall now find one of those literary prizes in hopes perhaps of hitting upon which the penny public endures so many blanks. I was quite prepared to have my blood curdled; my lips were whetted for a full draught of gore; yet, I give you my word, there was nothing in the whole story worse than a bankruptcy.

This is what makes the success of penny fiction so remarkable; there is nothing whatever in the way of dramatic interest to account for it; nor of impropriety either. Like the lady friend of Dr. Johnson, who congratulated him that there were no improper words in his dictionary, and received from that unconciliatory sage the reply, 'You have been looking for them, have you?' I have carefully searched my fifty samples of penny fiction for something wrong, and have not found it. It is as pure as milk, or at all events as milk and water. Unlike the Minerva Press, too, it does not deal with eminent persons: wicked peers are rare; fraud is usually confined within what may be called its natural limit—the lawyer's office; the attention paid to the heroines not only by their heroes, but by their unsuccessful and objectionable rivals, is generally of the most honourable kind; and platitude and dulness hold undisputed sway.

In one or two of these periodicals there is indeed an example of the mediæval melodrama; but *Ralpho the Mysterious* is by no means thrilling. Indeed, when I remember that *Ivanhoe* was once published in a penny journal and proved a total failure, and then contemplate the popularity of *Ralpho*, I am more at sea as to what it is that attracts the million than ever.

'Noble youth,' cried the King as he embraced Ralpho, 'to you we must entrust the training of our cavalry. I hold here the list which has been made out of the troops which will come at the signal. To certain of our nobles we have entrusted certain of our *corps d'armée*, but unto you, Ralpho, we must entrust our horse, for

in that service you can display that wonderful dexterity with the sword which has made your name so famous.'

'Sire,' cried our hero, as he dropped on one knee and took the king's hand, pressing it to his lips, 'thou hast indeed honoured me by such a reward, but I cannot accept it.'

'How,' cried the King, 'hast thou so soon tired of my service?'

'Not so, sire. To serve you I would shed the last drop of my blood. But if I were to accept this command, I should cease to do the service for the cause which now it has pleased you to say I have done. No, sire, let me remain the guardian of my king—his secret agent. I, with my sword alone, will defend my country and my king.'

'Be not rash, Ralpho; already hast thou done more than any man ever did before. Run no more danger.'

'Sire, if I have served you, grant my request. Let it be as I have said.'

'It shall be so, mysterious youth. Thou shalt be my secret agent. Take this ring, and wear it for my sake;—and, hark ye, gentlemen, when Ralpho shows that ring, obey him as if he were ourselves.'

'We will,' cried the nobles.

Then the King took the Star of St. Stanislaus, and fixed it on our hero's breast.

Now, to my mind, though his preferring to be 'a secret agent' to becoming generalissimo of the Polish cavalry is as modest as it is original, *Ralpho* is too goody goody to be called 'the mysterious.' He reminds me, too, in his way of mixing chivalry with self-interest, of those enterprising officers in fighting regiments who send in applications for their own V.C.s while their comrades remain in modest expectation of them.

I am inclined to think, however, from the following advertisement, that some author has been recently piling up the virtues of his hero too strongly for the very delicate stomachs of the penny public, who, it is evident, resent superlatives of all kinds, and are commonplace and conventional to the marrow of their bones: '*T. B. Timmins is informed that he cannot be promised another story like "Mandragora," since, in deciding the contents of our journal, the tastes of readers have to be considered whose interest cannot be aroused by the impossible deeds of impossible creatures.*' Alas! I wish from my heart I knew what 'deeds' or 'creatures' do arouse the interest of this (to me) inexplicable public; for though I have before me the stories they obviously take delight in, why they do so I cannot tell.

At the 'Answers to Correspondents,' indeed, which form a leading feature in most of these penny journals, one may exclaim with the colonel in *Woodstock*, when after many ghosts he grapples with Wildrake, 'Thou at least art palpable.' Here we have the real readers, asking questions upon matters that concern them; and from these we shall surely get at the back of their minds. But it is unfortunately not so certain that these 'Answers to Correspondents' are not themselves fictions, like all the rest—only invented by the editor instead of the author, and coming in handy to fill up a vacant page. It is to

my mind incredible that a public so every way different from that of the Mechanics' Institute, and to whom mere information is likely to be anything but attractive, should be genuinely solicitous to learn that '*Needles were first made in England in Cheapside, in the reign of Queen Mary, by a negro from Spain;*' or that '*The family name of the Duke of Norfolk is Howard, although the younger members of it call themselves Talbot.*'

Even the remonstrance of 'Our Correspondence Editor' with a gentleman who wishes to learn '*How to manufacture dynamite*' seems to me artificial; as though the idea of saying a few words in season against explosive compounds had occurred to him, without any particular opportunity having really offered itself for the expression of his views.

There are, however, one or two advertisements decidedly genuine, and which prove that the readers of penny fiction are not so immersed in romance but that they have their eyes open to the main chance and their material responsibilities. '*ANXIOUS TO KNOW,*' for example, is informed that '*The widow, unless otherwise decreed, keeps possession of furniture on her marriage, and the daughter cannot claim it;*' while SKIBBS is assured that '*After such a lapse of time there will be no danger of a warrant being issued for leaving his wife and family chargeable to the parish.*'

As when Mr. Wilkie Collins made his first voyage of discovery into these unknown latitudes, the penny journals are largely used for forming matrimonial engagements, and for adjudicating upon all questions of propriety in connection with the affections. '*It is just bordering on folly,*' '*NANCY BLAKE*' is informed, '*to marry a man six years your junior.*' In answer to an inquiry from '*LOVING OLIVIA*' whether '*an engaged gentleman is at liberty to go to a theatre without taking his young lady with him,*' she is told '*Yes; but we imagine he would not often do so.*'

Some tender questions are mixed up with others of a more practical sort. '*LADY HILDA*' is informed that '*it is very seldom children are born healthy whose father has married before he is three-and-twenty; that long engagements are not only unnecessary but injurious; and that washing the head will remove the scurf.*' '*LEONE*' is assured that '*it is not necessary to be married in two churches, one being quite sufficient;*' that '*there is no truth in the saying that it is unlucky to marry a person of the same complexion;*' and that '*a gentle aperient will remove nettle-rash.*'

'*VIRGINIE*' (who, by the way, should surely be VIRGINIUS) is thus tenderly sympathised with:—

'*It does seem rather hard that you should be deprived of all opportunity of having a tête-à-tête with your betrothed, owing to her being obliged to entertain other company, although there are others of the family who can do so; still, as her mother insists upon it,*

and will not let you enjoy the society of her daughter uninterrupted, you might resort to a little harmless strategy, and whenever your stated evenings for calling are broken in on that way, ask the young lady to take a walk with you, or go to a place of amusement. She can then excuse herself to her friends without a breach of etiquette, and you can enjoy your tête-à-tête undisturbed.'

The photographs of lady correspondents which are received by the editors of most of these journals are apparently very numerous, and, if we may believe their description of them, all ravishingly beautiful. It is no wonder they receive many applications of the following nature :—

'CLYDE, a rising young doctor, twenty-two, fair, with a nice house and servants, being tired of bachelor life, wishes to receive the carte-de-visite of a dark, fascinating young lady, of from seventeen to twenty years of age ; no money essential, but good birth indispensable. She must be fond of music and children, and very loving and affectionate.'

Another doctor,—

'Twenty-nine, of a loving and amiable disposition, and who has at present an income of 120l. a-year, is desirous to make an immediate engagement with a lady about his own age, who must be possessed of a little money, so that by their united efforts he may soon become a member of a lucrative and honourable profession.'

How the 'united efforts' of two young people, however enthusiastic, can make a man an M.D. or an M.R.C.S. (except that love conquers all things) is more than one can understand. The last advertisement I shall quote affects me nearly, for it is from an eminent member of my own profession :—

'ALEXIS, a popular author in the prime of life, of an affectionate disposition, and fond of home, and the extent and pressing nature of whose work have prevented him from mixing much in society, would be glad to correspond with a young lady not above thirty. She must be of a pleasing appearance, amiable, intelligent and domestic.'

If it is with the readers of penny fiction that Alexis has established his popularity, I would like to know how he did it, and who he is. To discover this last is, however, an impossibility. These novelists all write anonymously, nor do their works ever appear before the public in another guise. There is sometimes a melancholy pretence to the contrary put forth in the 'Answers to Correspondents.' 'PHŒNIX,' for example, is informed that *'The story about which he inquires will not be published in book form at the time he mentions.'* But the fact is it will never be so published at all. It has been written, like all its congeners, for the unknown millions and for no one else.

Some years ago, in a certain great literary organ, it was stated of

one of these penny journals (which has not forgotten to advertise the eulogy) that 'its novels are equal to the best works of fiction to be got at the circulating libraries.' The critic who so expressed himself must have done so in a moment of hilarity which I trust was not produced by liquor; for 'the best works of fiction to be got at the circulating libraries' obviously include those of George Eliot, Trollope, Reade, Black and Blackmore, while the novels I am discussing are inferior to the worst. They are as crude and ineffective in their pictures of domestic life as they are deficient in dramatic incident; they are vapid, they are dull. Indeed, the total absence of humour, and even of the least attempt at it, is most remarkable. There is now and then a description of the playing of some practical joke, such as tying two Chinamen's tails together, the effect of the relation of which is melancholy in the extreme, but there is no approach to fun in the whole penny library. And yet it attracts, it is calculated, four millions of readers—a fact which makes my mouth water like that of Tantalus.

When Mr. Wilkie Collins wrote of the Unknown Public it is clear he was still hopeful of them. He thought it 'a question of time' only. 'The largest audience,' he says, 'for periodical literature in this age of periodicals must obey the universal law of progress, and sooner or later learn to discriminate. When that period comes the readers who rank by millions will be the readers who give the widest reputations, who return the richest rewards, and who will therefore command the services of the best writers of their time.' This prophecy has, curiously enough, been fulfilled in a different direction from that anticipated by him who uttered it. The penny papers—that is, the provincial penny newspapers—do now, under the syndicate system, command the services of our most eminent novel writers; but Penny Fiction proper—that is to say, the fiction published in the penny literary journals—is just where it was a quarter of a century ago.

With the opportunity of comparison afforded to its readers one would say this would be impossible, but as a matter of fact, the opportunity is *not* offered. The readers of Penny Fiction do not read newspapers; political events do not interest them, nor even social events, unless they are of the class described in the *Police News*, which, I remark—and the fact is not without significance—does not need to add fiction to its varied attractions.

But who, it will be asked, are the public who don't read newspapers, and whose mental calibre is such that they require to be told by a correspondence editor that 'any number over the two thousand will certainly be in the three thousand'?

I believe, though the vendors of the commodity in question profess to be unable to give any information on the matter, that the majority are female domestic servants.

As to what attracts them in their favourite literature, that is a much more knotty question. My own theory is that, just as Mr. Tupper achieved his immense popularity by never going over the heads of his readers, and showing that poetry was, after all, not such a difficult thing to be understood, so, I think, the writers of Penny Fiction, in clothing very conventional thoughts in rather high-faluting English, have found the secret of success. Each reader says to himself (or herself), 'That is *my* thought, which I would have myself expressed in those identical words, if I had only known how.'

JAMES PAYN.

THE RELIGION OF ZOROASTER.

THE interchange of ideas between writers and readers of all nationalities effected in the present day by increased facilities of communication, and the new light thrown on the religions of the East by the editing and translating of their sacred books, make a change of attitude towards non-Christian systems unavoidable. Until recently it was customary to regard every religion of the world, except Judaism and Christianity, as unworthy of scientific investigation. Any Christian who ventured to assert that any human being had benefited by his faith in any of the doctrines of a non-Christian religion, or that elements of truth might possibly underlie such doctrines, was at once suspected of disloyalty to his own faith. Furthermore, all Asiatic systems which appeared to be specially saturated with polytheism and idolatry were stigmatised by a special application of such opprobrious epithets as heathenism and paganism. They were not mere silly delusions. They were the outcome of man's diseased imagination, stimulated by the promptings of the evil one himself. All who believed in them were sinners. As to their so-called sacred books, they were held up to reprobation and derision. The writers of them were guilty of far greater sin than those who believed in them. And any Christian who attempted to examine them reverently and impartially on their best side, or from the point of view of those who accepted their inspiration, was guilty of almost as great a sin. Even unidolatrous Muhammadanism was denounced in equally strong language—though its stern iconoclasm and its admitted points of contact with Judaism and Christianity saved it from the ignominy of consignment to the general limbo of the more despised and neglected heathen systems.

No Christian thinker, in fact, suspected—or, at least, confessed to suspecting—what the science of religion is now demonstrating: that all false systems result from perversions or exaggerations of true ideas; that the principal non-Christian religions of the world—Brāhmanism, Buddhism, Zoroastrianism, and Muhammadanism—could not possibly have held their ground with such tenacity, nor acquired such real power over the mind, unless they had attempted with some success to solve problems which have from time immemorial

perplexed the human intellect and burdened the human heart; that all the religions of the world have some common platform on which they may meet on friendly terms; and that Christianity itself is but the perfect concentration and embodiment of eternal truth scattered in fragments through other systems—the perfect expression of all the religious cravings and aspirations of the human race since man was first created.

Perhaps few more remarkable facts have been revealed by the critical examination of non-Christian systems than the highly spiritual character of the ancient creed which it is usual to call the religion of Zoroaster. Only within the last few years has the progress of Iranian studies made it possible to gain an insight into the true meaning of the text of the Avesta—popularly known as the Zend Avesta—which is to Zoroastrianism what the Veda is to Brāhmanism. The knowledge thus obtained has made it clear that contemporaneously with Judaism an unidolatrous and monotheistic form of religion, containing a high moral code and many points of resemblance to Judaism itself, was developed by at least one branch of the Āryan race.

Nor does the certainty of this fact rest on the testimony of the Zoroastrian scriptures only. It is attested by numerous allusions in the writings of Greek and Latin authors. We know that the Father of history himself, writing about 450 years before the Christian era, said of the Persians that ‘it is not customary among them to make idols, to build temples and erect altars; they even upbraid with folly those who do.’ The reason of this Herodotus declares to be that the Persians do not believe the gods to be like men, as the Hellenes do, but that they identify the whole celestial circle with the Supreme Being.

We know, too, that Cyrus the Great, who must have been a Zoroastrian, evinced great sympathy with the Jews; and was styled by Isaiah ‘the righteous one’ (ch. xli. 2), ‘the Shepherd of the Lord’ (ch. xlv. 28), ‘the Lord’s Anointed’ (ch. xlv. 1), who was commissioned to ‘perform all God’s pleasure’ and carry out His decrees in regard to the rebuilding of the temple, and the restoration of the chosen people to their native land.¹

It will be my aim in the present paper to give a brief description—based on the most recent researches—of the various phases of the Zoroastrian religion from its earliest rise in Central Asia to its latest development among the Pārsis of India.

Unfortunately, the whole subject, full as it is of importance and interest, is also fraught with extreme difficulty.

¹ In Ezra i. 2–4, Cyrus is represented as acknowledging Jehovah to be the God. But Canon Rawlinson has shown in a late number of the *Contemporary Review* that if the interpretation of a recently discovered inscription is to be relied on, Cyrus was not the monotheist and iconoclast he is generally represented to have been, but simply a time-server and syncretist.

Its importance must not be measured by the number of persons in the world—at present barely amounting to one hundred thousand—who profess the Zoroastrian creed, but rather by its connection with the history of the ancient Persians who—inheritors of the greatness and glory of their precursors, the Assyrians and Babylonians—were the first of all the Āryan races to achieve empire, and were for a time the most conspicuous and remarkable people on the surface of the globe, influencing by their religious and philosophical ideas, by their literature, laws, and social institutions, the intellectual development of the whole human race.

Nor, again, is the interest of the subject due so much to the independent merit of the system itself as to the nature of the doctrines which it has in common with Judaism, and through it with Christianity,² and to the intimate relationship subsisting between the religion of the Avesta and that of the ancient religion of our Indian fellow-subjects.

On the other hand the intricacy of the inquiry is due to the utterly corrupt and fragmentary condition of the sacred writings and traditions on which the whole system rests, and to the conflict of opinion among scholars as to their interpretation.

With a view to greater perspicuity, I propose to arrange my explanations in the form of answers to the following questions:—
1. What is the probable origin of the people commonly called Iranian, who became followers of Zoroaster? 2. What do we know of Zoroaster, and what was the character of the religious system he inaugurated? 3. How did his doctrines become affected by the migration of his disciples into Persia? 4. What are the exact nature and present condition of the sacred writings on which Zoroastrianism is founded? 5. Why and how was the system expelled from Persia and transferred to India? 6. What modifications have the Indian Pārsis introduced into the Zoroastrian creed?

I. To begin with the early history of the Iranian people. I need scarcely point out that the Iranians were an offshoot from the great Āryan stock. The designation Iranian ought not strictly to be applied to them until their settlement in Persia. It is a term derived from Irān, the name given to ancient Persia in contradistinction to Tūrān, the vast region of Central Asia occupied by the uncivilised Turkish tribes.³ For convenience and to distinguish the Iranian from other Āryan races, especially from the Indo-Āryans, I propose to call them Irano-Āryans.

There was a time, at least 2,000 years B.C., when Irano-Āryans and Indo-Āryans lived together as fellow-countrymen, along with the

² The Magi of the New Testament may have been simply wise men from Babylon or Persia, but it is more likely that they were Zoroastrian priests or religious emissaries deputed to express sympathy with the Jews on the occasion of so great an event as the birth of Christ.

³ Tūrān was so called from Tūr, eldest son of Faridūp, a king of Persia who reigned about 750 years B.C., and who assigned Turkistān to his son.

ancestors of Englishmen and of the principal European nations, in some central region of Asia—probably the extensive tract of table-land north of the Hindū Kūsh, usually known as the Pamīr plateau. This region was the primeval home of all the Āryan races, both Asiatic and European. There they spoke the same language, worshipped the same gods, obeyed the same laws, and were called by the same name (*ārya*, excellent). The climate was in general cold and ungenial, yet favourable to the development of a hardy race of inhabitants, partly nomad in their habits, partly agricultural, who very soon multiplied beyond the capacity of the soil to support the entire population. Emigration then became a necessity. The most enterprising led the way. Some descended into the valley of the Indus and the plains of the Panjāb, passing through the passes of Afghānistān, the Chitral valley, and Kāsmīr. These were the ancestors of the Indo-Āryans. Others either occupied the highlands and region north of Kābul, or descended into the valley of the Oxus, following the course of that river and settling in the rich adjacent country including the whole region afterwards called Bactria, of which Balkh (the present capital of Afghān Turkistān) and Samarkand eventually became the chief cities. These were the ancestors of the Irano-Āryans or Iranians. When they found themselves becoming prosperous in their new settlements, they naturally sent messages to relatives and friends, urging them to follow. Hence there was a constant succession of fresh arrivals.

Possibly some of the progenitors of the Indo-Āryans may have first settled in Bactria, and dwelt for a time with the Iranians until quarrels and rivalries caused a separation, and led them to follow those who had descended to the plains of India through Afghānistān. All the chronology and topography of this period must be more or less conjectural. Nevertheless many valuable geographical hints are to be gathered from the first Fargard of the Vendīdād, constituting the opening chapter of the Zend Avesta. Its allusions to localities are obscure, but they warrant an inference that the primeval seat of the Āryans was a country in which winter prevailed for ten months of the year, and that the migrations of the Iranians extended through Sogdiana and Bactria to Merv and Herat.

When the Irano-Āryans first settled in the valley of the Oxus and the Indo-Āryans in the valley of the Indus, their language, customs, and religious ideas must have been nearly identical. No sooner, however, did they begin their new life in their adopted countries than differences and divergences, the result of differences of climate, circumstances, and surroundings, began to be developed.

And first as to language. The original Āryan speech went through a process of greater scientific elaboration in the one case than in the other. On the fertile plains watered by the Indus and the Ganges, a large class of thinking men were set free from agricultural labour

to pursue their speculations undisturbed. Their first thoughts were directed towards the analysis of speech. The raw material they brought with them in the shape of their own mother-tongue was like the finest ore or clay—ductile, expansible, plastic, capable of being moulded and fashioned with the greatest artistic skill. All that was wanted was that men should be forthcoming capable of manipulating it. Such men were the grammatical giants Pāṇini, Kātyāyana, and Patanjali. In their hands the rough-hewn elements of speech very soon acquired regularity and beauty of form, and a language was produced in upper India, which, from the perfection of its structure, was called Sanskrit—a language which, in regard to the light it has thrown on the science of grammar generally, has never been matched.

The Irano-Āryans, on the other hand, who first settled in Bactria, were not so favoured by circumstances of climate and position. They were unable to support a learned class. They brought with them, like the Indo-Āryans, a form of speech rich in vocabulary and inflexions, but they did comparatively little towards improving and developing it. The East-Iranian language, which by an unfortunate mistake has been called Zend or Zand—a name more correctly applicable to the Pahlavī translation and interpretation of their so-called book of revelation, the Avesta,⁴—attained its extreme limit of development in the Avesta. This book, however, presents us with both an earlier and a later dialect of Zend. The early form is found in the Gāthā portion of the Avesta ascribed more directly to Zoroaster. The later has its best representative in the Vendīdād and Yashts. Zend and Vedic Sanskrit are really two sisters, and the family likeness between them is strong.⁵ The more corrupt system of vocalisation traceable in the Zend of the Avesta may be attributed, perhaps, to its long continued oral transmission. Many words in both dialects of the Avesta read as if they were mere corruptions of Vedic counterparts. Yet it is certain that the Zend language is not derived from Sanskrit, that it is very different from Sanskrit, and has even preserved some more primitive grammatical forms than its sister tongue. Unhappily it has no literature of any kind beyond the Avesta. Nor has it any lineal linguistic descendants. Zend is absolutely barren in both these respects. Modern Persian is a descendant not of Zend but of a sister language, the ancient Persian preserved in the Achæmenian cuneiform inscriptions, and the line of its descent appears to have been from this Achæmenian Persian—which was formed in Persia by

⁴ Zend, which should have been written Zand, is from the root zan (= Sanskrit jñā, Greek and Latin γινω and gno), to know. According to Oppert, Zend means 'prayer,' and Avesta, 'divine law.' West is more probably right in connecting Avesta with the Sanskrit *ā-vid*, to make known to (the world). The proper meaning of Avesta would then be 'Divine declaration,' or 'revelation,' and Zand is the Pahlavī translation.

⁵ Haug gives as examples *kerenaomi*, I make = Vedic *krinomi*; *jamaiti*, he goes = Vedic *gamati*; *gerenāmi*, I take = Vedic *grībhāmi*; so also *ahmai*, to him = *asmāi*.

Iranian immigrants about the eighth century B.C.—through Pahlavī and Pārsī⁶ to the Persian of the Shāh Nāmāh of Firdūsī, written about the end of the tenth century of our era. But Achæmenian Persian is separated from Pahlavī by a blank of five or six centuries. Pahlavī was the spoken language of Persia during the rule of the Sāsānian kings (commencing with Ardashīr Bābakān, A.D. 226).⁷ It was ancient Persian largely intermixed with Semitic (Chaldee) words and forms. The greater part of its extensive literature has been lost. Hence it has happened that Iranian literature presents a remarkable contrast to the continuity of Sanskrit literature. The latter extends in an unbroken line from the R̥ig-Veda to modern times. But a vast desert intervenes between the earliest Iranian writings (the Zend-Avesta and Achæmenian inscriptions), and Firdūsī's Shāh Nāmāh, relieved only by a few unattractive literary oases, represented by such works as have been rescued from the wreck of Pahlavī literature.⁸

In the next place as to religion. I need scarcely repeat what has been often pointed out, that the Āryan progenitors of Iranians and Indians were naturally endowed with religious capacities of no ordinary kind. They were profoundly conscious of their constant dependence on the mysterious forces which governed their own existence and regulated the order of the universe. Of course their ideas of the due relationship and distinction between spirit and matter were at first vague and confused. Nor did they at an early period form any definite conception of a personal god or gods. They worshipped exactly what it was natural for a pastoral and agricultural people to worship in a bleak inhospitable region, where the welfare of herds and crops depended on the seasonable return of genial summer days, and where chilling blasts held undisputed sway for ten months of the year. The influences of heat, light, and moisture were above all things to be desired and prayed for, while the effects of cold, darkness, and storm were above all things to be dreaded and deprecated. But heat, light, and moisture had their visible embodiments in Sun, Fire, and Air. Very soon, therefore, personality and power began to be associated with Sun, Fire, and Air. These three objects began to be adored as a kind of natural trinity, the triple repository of mighty beneficent forces whose operation was essential to the welfare of mankind.

⁶ Pārsī is merely a later form of vernacular Persian later than Pahlavī. It is sometimes called Pāzand. But Pāzand, according to Mr. West, means 're-explanation,' and ought rather to be applied to Pahlavī when it is transliterated either in Avestan or modern Persian characters.

⁷ Pahlavī is probably for Parthvī, the Parthians having been the rulers of Persia when the Pahlavī language was in the act of forming.

⁸ The Dinkard, edited and translated by Dastur Peshetānji of Bombay, is the most extensive Pahlavī work that has been preserved; but the Bundahish, or 'Original Creation,' is perhaps the best known and most interesting. It has just been translated by Mr. E. W. West, and forms one of the series of 'Sacred Books of the East,' edited by Professor Max Müller.

Doubtless other objects and phenomena of nature gradually received homage, but only in connection with one or other member of this trinity or tri-unity of divine objects. And it is certain that in worshipping Nature through all her multiplicity of manifestations, the more thoughtful Āryans regarded her as essentially one. They had a profound conviction that unity, harmony, and order (*Rita*) reigned supreme amid the diversity of her interacting and apparently counteracting and conflicting agencies. They had a distinct conception of One controlling Spirit of Heaven animating and quickening all natural operations, and presiding as a monitor over their own wills and consciences.

And what, it may be asked, were the earliest names given to the several members of this tri-unity of adorable objects, and especially to the one pervading and presiding lord of heaven? Were these names so cherished by each branch of the Āryan family as to be carried with them to their adopted homes and there perpetuated?

This is an important inquiry; for the character of every religious system may generally be inferred from the names given to its God or gods. Can any term, for example, be more significant of Christian Trinitarian truth than the holy name *Elohim*, a plural noun requiring a singular verb, or the still more sacred name *Yehovah* (*Jehovah*), expressive of 'I was, I am, I shall be,' or the name most highly prized by Christians, *Yehoshua* (*Jesus*), a compound word meaning Divine Saviour? Or, again, what can be more significant of stern unbending monotheism than the Muslim's *Allah*, the Almighty One, always singular and alone, always without a partner in his terrible Omnipotence?

Turning, then, to the earliest Āryan designations for divine beings, and comparing some of the names still in use among Iranians and Indians, we find that the general name for their objects of adoration was *Deva*, 'luminous ones,' and that the earliest special names for sun, fire, and air were *Mitra* (melting), *Athar* (piercing), and *Vāyu* or *Vāta* (blowing), respectively, while the earliest name for the all-investing deity of heaven, sometimes regarded as one supreme Deity, was either *Dyaus*, which like *Deva* meant 'the Luminous One,' or *Varuna*, the All-Investor, or *Asura*, 'the Breather.'⁹ Furthermore, a title *Yajata*, meaning 'worthy of homage,' was applied as an epithet to all the gods. Not more than three or four other objects had special names so cherished as to survive the shock of transportation to distant localities.¹⁰

Such, then, was the simple form of nature-worship which the

* This epithet, which originally signified 'a living deity,' and properly belonged to the chief gods (such as *Varuna*, *Indra*, *Agni*, *Savitri*, *Rudra*), is sometimes applied to all the gods (see *Rigv.* i, 108. 6). Compare *Genesis* ii. 7, where God is said to have created Adam and 'breathed into his nostrils the breath of life.'

¹⁰ Examples of these are *Aryaman* (= *Zend Airyaman*), *Vritra-ha* (= *Verethraghna* or *Behrām*), *Aramati* (= *Armaiti*), *Bhaga* (= *Bagha*).

Irano-Aryans and Indo-Aryans carried with them, the one to their adopted country in Bactria, the other to their first settlements in India.

We have now to account for the difference and antagonism which ultimately arose in the development of these elementary religious ideas among Indians and Iranians.

We have seen that a large surplus population of non-agriculturists were easily supported in Upper India, and that a certain number applied themselves to the elaboration of language. A similar class of thinking men were set free to devote their attention to religious investigations. These men took advantage of the devotional feelings of their fellow-countrymen to advance their own interests. They formed themselves into an association of priests, and declared themselves the sole channels and instruments of all religious operations, the sole appointed mediators between men and gods. They even laid claim to divine attributes and powers in their own persons. Then, taking the belief in the one living all-investing Spirit of Heaven (the great Asura Varuna) as the basis of a new spiritual theory, they maintained that all Nature was a simple development or expansion of that Spirit, whose epithets or titles they changed from Varuna, 'All-investor,' and Asura, 'Breather,' to *Brahma*,¹¹ 'Expander.' They themselves were his highest human development, and therefore to be called *Brāhmana*. Of course so lofty a doctrine could only be for the few. The masses were to be encouraged in their worship of the *Devas*. They were to be kept in religious subjection by the promotion of superstitious ideas. They were to be instigated to multiply material objects of adoration; to convert heroes and holy men into new *Devas*; to deify or demonise stocks and stones, trees, rivers, and animals, qualities of the mind, virtues and vices; to people earth, air, heaven, and hell, with gods, goddesses, demigods, and demons of all shapes, sizes, and degrees—semi-human, super-human, many-headed, many-armed, many-eyed, wielding all sorts of weapons, borne through space on all sorts of beasts and birds—fulfilling every possible function as gods of creation or destruction, good or evil, beauty or deformity, wisdom or stupidity, peace or war, love or hatred, mercy or ferocity. Hence the three principal gods of the Veda—Sun, Fire, and Air—went through a process of multiplication first by eleven into thirty-three, and ultimately by 10,000,000 into 330,000,000. If the higher doctrine of the *Brāhmins* was exaggerated spiritual pantheism, this popular teaching was clearly something worse than exaggerated polytheism. It was polytheism of the grossest and most monstrous kind, aggravated by the worst forms of fetish superstitions.

In Bactria, on the other hand, the entire Iranian population were compelled to seek support in agricultural labour. Each man had his

¹¹ *Brahma* might perhaps be rendered by 'Expansion,' and *Brahmā* by 'Expander.'

piece of land and his homestead. Each man regarded the tilling of the soil as his noblest occupation. Each man, also, was his own priest, and aspired to no higher religion than the worship of the cherished gods of his fatherland—the deities of Sun, Fire, and Air, or the other deified powers of Nature through whose beneficent agency he cultivated his fields in peace and plenty. If he belonged to the more thoughtful minority, his homage was also given to the one eternal all-pervading spirit of heaven, one of whose epithets passed among the Iranians from Asura into Ahura. •

Of course the influence of the idolatrous Turanian races with whom they came into contact gradually led to some change in the religious ideas and practices of the Iranian population.

It must be noted, moreover, that the colder Bactrian climate caused Sun and Fire to receive more persistent and intensified homage among the Iranians than among the Indo-Āryans; just as among the latter the greater need of rain gave greater prominence to the worship of the spirit of the air, who, though he retained the name Vāyu, was more commonly worshipped in India under the peculiarly Indian appellation Indra.

In process of time, too, other differences began to show themselves in the religious notions of the two kindred races—differences brought about not only by contact with the varying superstitions of the non-Āryan tribes who preoccupied the soil in both countries, but by a curious change of attitude in the mind of the Iranians towards some of the beings called Devas. This change cannot, in my opinion, be wholly accounted for by any theories¹² of different processes of development under different influences in different localities, but must partly be attributed to the springing up of social jealousies, quarrels, and controversies between neighbouring races peculiarly liable from their juxtaposition to come into collision with each other.

The non-agricultural Indo-Aryans, be it observed, could not all be priests or scholars. A large number formed themselves into a military class, and as fighting men they could not be idle. They became not only defenders (*Kshatriyas*) but aggressors. Nor did they confine themselves to attacks and encroachments on the aboriginal occupants of Indian soil. They frequently looked with hankering eyes on the possessions of their relatives the Iranians, and organised raids through the mountain-passes for the seizure of their flocks and herds. Of course those who were attacked became in their turn assailants, and counter-raids on the part of the Iranians were probably not uncommon. Often the homesteads assaulted were so well fortified that severe combats took place, and much blood was shed. Now it was observed by the Iranians, who were generally vanquished by their more warlike relatives, that before every encounter the Indo-Āryans invoked the aid of their Devas, especially

¹² Such as the theories elaborated by Professor Darmesteter and others.

their favourite Indra, supposed to be propitiated by offerings of intoxicating Soma-juice. What was more natural than that feelings of hatred towards some of these Devas should spring up in the mind of the aggrieved Iranians? To them the word *Deva* began to appear like a synonym for demon, and Indra, the spirit of the power of the air, became transformed into a spirit of evil. In the same way the word *Asura*, which was cherished by the Iranians as a name for their deities, acquired among the Indians an exactly opposite signification. There can be little doubt that some of the earliest battles of the world were fought out in Afghānistān and the passes into India, and were due to the quarrels and conflicts between Irano-Āryans and Indo-Āryans. At any rate it is certain that these formed the historical basis of the legendary accounts of constant warfare between gods and demons (*Devas* and *Asuras*), which abound in Sanskrit literature.

It was at a period when the religion of the Irano-Āryans had begun to suffer from the operation of such disturbing causes, that a great prophet and reformer appeared to arrest the advance of his fellow-countrymen in the path of superstition and idolatry, and to bid them fix their faith on the One Living God, Ahura, thenceforward to be known as Ahura Mazda, the Everliving and Omniscient Lord.¹³

This prophet and reformer was Spitama Zoroaster.

II. What, then, do we know of Zoroaster, and what was the character of the system he inaugurated?

Whether the theory propounded by Darmesteter that Zoroaster is a mythological personage who never existed anywhere except in myths, can be accepted, is to my mind more than doubtful. I need scarcely say that he is certainly not to be identified with Abraham, according to another theory actually propounded by some Muhammadan writers, and even accepted by a few Europeans. His name, as it appears in the Avesta, is Zarathushtra. This was Persianised into Zardusht, and has been Europeanised into Zoroaster. Probably there was but one great Zoroaster, just as there was but one great Buddha; but, like Buddha, he may have been preceded and followed by other great religious teachers, to all of whom the generic title Zarathushtra (supposed by Haug to mean 'venerable chief') may possibly have been applied. And this theory is supported by the fact that when the great Zarathushtra is expressly designated, it is common to prefix his family name Spitama¹⁴ as a distinguishing epithet. Hence we often read of Spitama Zarathushtra, as we do of Gautama

¹³ There is a difference of opinion as to the exact meaning of Ahura Mazda. Darmesteter and others consider that Ahura means Sovereign or Lord, a secondary sense, the original *Asura* signifying 'living' or 'breathing.' Haug thinks that Mazda, although phonetically equivalent to *Modhas*, 'wise,' 'omniscient,' also means 'creator.' It is noteworthy that as *Deva* changed its meaning to *demon* among the Iranians, so did *Asura* among the Indians.

¹⁴ Generally written Spitama, but in Pahlavi written Spītmān.

Buddha. As to the parentage and biography of the great Iranian prophet nothing whatever of any historical value has come down to us.* Greek and Roman philosophers believed Zoroaster to have been the inventor of magic. According to Eudoxus and Aristotle, quoted by Pliny, Zoroaster taught his system about six thousand years before Plato. Xanthos, an historian of Lydia, fixed the period of his career at six hundred years before the Trojan war, or about 1,800 years B.C. Other statements and allusions in Greek and Roman writers are equally untrustworthy; as, for example, that of Hermippos of Smyrna, who asserted that Zoroaster's powers of fasting enabled him to subsist for twenty years on cheese only. Haug informs us that Berosos, a Babylonian historian, described Zoroaster as a king of the Medians, who conquered Babylon about 2,200 B.C. According to others he was a Babylonian by birth. The Pārsīs themselves maintain that he flourished in the time of Darius Hystaspes (Gustāshp), between 500 and 550 B.C., and that he was born at Ragha (Raī), near Teheran. This is not borne out by any allusions on the trilingual cuneiform inscriptions, nor by any satisfactory inferences deducible from other data. If, as is possible, Zoroaster and his immediate disciples were the authors of the Gāthās, or songs, which constitute the oldest part of the Avesta, and which in language, metre, and style closely resemble some of the R̥ig-Veda hymns, he must have lived nearly contemporaneously with, or not long subsequently to, the authors of those hymns.¹⁵ After a careful consideration of various conflicting probabilities, I am inclined to subscribe to the theory that he was born in the neighbourhood of Balkh in Bactria about the twelfth century B.C.¹⁶ A work, called *Zardusht Nāmāh*, supposed to be his biography, was written in Persian by a Pārsī named Zartusht-Behrām in the year 1277 of our era. Dr. Hyde of Oxford, who, in the beginning of the eighteenth century, was the first European to inquire scientifically into the Zoroastrian system, was also the first to give an account of this *Zardusht Nāmāh*. Its absolute worthlessness, except as a collection of fantastic figments, was shown by the late Dr. John Wilson, of Bombay, who gave a summary of its contents in his *Pārsī Religion*.

The infant Zoroaster is described as having caused much consternation by behaving very differently from other infants, and bursting into a hearty laugh when he came into the world. This strange conduct filled the fraternity of magicians—who appear to have been as active among the ancient Iranians as among the Egyptians and Jews—with the utmost dismay. Forthwith they cast about for the best means of getting rid of so dangerous a child. One stabbed him to

¹⁵ No mention is made of Brāhmans in the Avesta. The leaders of the Indo-Aryans are called Kavis as in the Veda. Nor is there any mention of the Modes, Persians, and Magians in the Avesta.

¹⁶ To regard Zoroaster as a wholly mythological personage because myths gathered round his name is tantamount to doubting the existence of half the great personages of antiquity.

the heart with a dagger ; another threw him into a blazing fire, in the midst of which the infant fell peaceably asleep ; a third sent some oxen, and a fourth some wild horses, to trample him to death. Of course the child was altogether magic-proof. When he had developed into a youth he was translated bodily to heaven. There he was admitted to hold converse with God himself, but not until melted brass had been poured over his breast, and the whole inside of his body miraculously taken out and put back again, without causing him the slightest inconvenience. The first revelation he seems to have received during this colloquy was that God is formed of light, and the devils of darkness. He was then taught the whole Avesta and commanded to proclaim it to the world.

Much more worthy of attention than the extravagant fables of the Zartusht-Nāmah is Firdūsi's account in his *Shāh Nāmah* written about 1000 A.D. It is there said : 'At the time of King Kāi Mustāshp there appeared once a holy man before the king at Balkh : he called himself Zerdosht ; he held in his hand a vessel containing miraculous fire, which was smokeless and burnt without wood or incense. He addressed the king and said : " I am a prophet, and will show thee the way to God ; the fire in my hand I received from Paradise, God himself gave it to me, saying : 'Take it ; therein is the image of heaven and earth ; receive from me now the true religion ; become enlightened and despise the world.' " The prophet had with him books which he said had been written by God Himself ; he called them Avesta and Zend, and in their tenets the king was instructed.'

What, then, were the tenets of Zoroaster referred to in the above passage ? Briefly it may be said that he did not aim at introducing a new religion, but at reforming an old one. He commenced his mission at a moment when his fellow-countrymen had begun to doubt the divinity of some of the Devas common to Bactria and India. Everywhere he found ready listeners and willing disciples. His object was to bring back his fellow-countrymen to what he believed to be the pure religion of their forefathers—the worship of the one living God under the oldest name of the god of heaven, Asura.¹⁷ He says of himself that he was sent to abolish Deva-worship and idolatry as fatal to body and soul, to spread life and truth and belief in the One God, to destroy lies and falsehood, to secure bodily as well as spiritual welfare, to propagate the blessings of civilisation, especially agriculture.¹⁸ The Devas were to be regarded as demons, not gods. Yet Zoroaster also says of himself that he had been directed to make no reforms without placing himself under the guidance of the angel Srosh (a personification of the national religion). He was to deal respectfully with the ancient creed. He was to perpetuate the adora-

¹⁷ See *Rigveda* v. 41. 3, 83. 6 ; i. 131. 1 ; iii. 29. 14.

¹⁸ In one passage he is called a prophet of the Spirit of earth, *Geus-urva*. (*Hang's Lecture*, p. 9.)

tion of fire called *Āthar*, son of *Ahura Mazda*, as a symbol of the Deity, and to maintain the ceremonies conducted by the fire-priests (*Athrava*). He was even to perpetuate some of the names of some of the old *Devas*, such as *Mithra* (Sanskrit *Mitra*) the sun, and *Airyaman* (Sanskrit *Aryaman*) 'the sun's associate.'¹⁹ Only they were no longer to be called *Devas* or worshipped as *Devas*. They were to be designated by the old epithet *Yajata* (changed in *Zend* to *Yazata*), and to receive homage as semi-divine beings or angels, not as gods.

Of course the true character of Zoroaster's religious teaching is mainly to be gathered from the *Avesta*, and indeed (as *Haug* has shown) from the *Gāthā* portion of that work only.²⁰ All the remaining portion of the Zoroastrian canon is the result of later accretions, and represents the system after much corruption. The five *Gāthās*, on the other hand, which, as we have seen, correspond in character to the *Āryan Vedic hymns*, are supposed to have been directly revealed to the prophet while in an ecstatic state by a choir of archangels who sang them in his ear. The heading of the first *Gāthā* (doubtless prefixed to it by a later compiler) is: 'The revealed thought, the revealed word, the revealed deed of the righteous *Zarathushtra*.' Probably not more than two of the five *Gāthās* (the *Ahunavaiti* and *Ushtavaiti*) are to be accepted as the composition of Zoroaster himself. Even in these two leading *Gāthās* occasional sentences appear to have been interpolated by his disciples. Unhappily, too, the dialect in which they are written is so obscure, and the text so corrupt, that no translation yet made can be wholly trusted. It may be assumed that *Haug's* version is as nearly accurate as can be expected in the present state of Iranian studies. We learn from it that Zoroaster began his mission by assembling his fellow-countrymen before the sacred fire, and making them a remarkable speech, the commencement of which is here epitomised:—

I will now tell you who are assembled here the wise sayings of *Mazda*, the praises of *Ahura*, the sublime truth which I see arising out of these sacred flames.

Contemplate the beams of fire with a pious mind. Every one, both men and women, ought to-day to choose between the *Deva* and the *Ahura* religion.

In the beginning there was a pair of twins, two spirits, each active; these are the good and the base, in thought, word, and deed. Choose one of these two spirits! Be good, not base!

And these two spirits created, one the reality, the other the non-reality. To the liar existence will become bad, whilst the believer in the true God enjoys prosperity.

Of these two spirits you must choose one; you cannot belong to both of them.

Thus let us be such as help the life of the future. The wise living spirits are the greatest supporters of it. The prudent man wishes only to be there where wisdom is at home.

¹⁹ A deity associated with *Mitra* and *Varuṇa*, and presiding over marriages.

²⁰ In the *Gāthās* Zoroaster is represented speaking in the first person. Elsewhere in the *Avesta* he is spoken of in the third person.

The twelfth chapter of the Yasna also deserves attention. It gives an early form of the Zoroastrian creed, to every article of which all who claim to be disciples of Zoroaster are obliged to subscribe. The more important part of the creed may be thus translated :—

I join in putting an end to the worship of Devas (false gods). I profess myself a believer in Mazda, the Omniscient, as taught by Zarathustra. I am a follower of the law of Ahura (the Living). 'All the universe I attribute to the wise and good Ahura Mazda, the pure, the majestic. Everything is his, the earth and the starry firmament. I denounce sorcery and all other evil knowledge. I denounce false gods, and those believing in them, with sincerity of thought, word, and deed. Thus Ahura Mazda has taught Zarathustra in the several conferences that took place between them.

No one can read the above extracts without coming to the conclusion that Zoroaster's conception of Ahura Mazda must have presented his disciples with a very lofty ideal of a Supreme Being, very different from that previously current among the Iranians, and not unworthy to be compared with the grand conception of the Elohim in the Old Testament. Ahura Mazda was the creator of the universe. Matter was created by him, and was neither identified with him nor an emanation from him. He was to be the sole object of worship as the sole source of life, light, goodness, wisdom, and creative power. We see, too, in Zoroaster's system the germ of other doctrines which bring it into striking harmony with Judaism and Christianity. For example, there is a clear intimation of a future life, without the slightest approach to the Hindū and Buddhist theories of metempsychosis. There is to be a distribution of rewards and punishments after death according to deeds done in the body. Even a resurrection of the dead and a reunion of soul and body are believed to have been taught. As to the moral code, it was worthy of Christianity itself, being comprised in six words, 'good thoughts, good words, good deeds,' which, again, were comprised in one word *Asha*, righteousness.²¹

Other doctrines to be noted are the following :—A man's only hope of salvation was to be in his own self-righteousness. He was to be rewarded hereafter not according to his belief in any particular religious dogma, but according to the perfection of his thoughts, words, and deeds; of his benevolence, his benediction (if I may coin a new word), and his beneficence. He was gifted with free-will. He could choose his own course; he was not the helpless slave of fate or destiny. He was to be judged according to his own works. The soul that sinned was to die, and no sacrifice or substitute was to be accepted. Nor was salvation or religious merit procurable through self-mortification. The Hindū idea of *tapas* or self-inflicted torture, as carried out by Yogīs and Fakīrs with the object of securing future beatitude, was an impossibility in the Zoroastrian system. Any one who compares the Zoroastrian theory of retribution with the teachings

²¹ This word *Asha* is believed to be cognate with the Vedic *Rita*, law and order.

in the eighteenth chapter of Ezekiel will be struck with the analogy it presents to the Jewish doctrine.

Furthermore, we see in Zoroaster's words a clear outline of the belief in a perpetual conflict between good and evil, and the duty of overcoming evil by good. 'Righteousness (*asha*) and unrighteousness, holiness and impiety, which were at first expressive of simple abstract ideas and opposite conditions of man's nature, became, in the end, endowed with real and personal existence. They became good spirits and bad, angels and demons. Very noteworthy, too, is the circumstance that in the demon-world there was an archfiend, or prince of the devils, corresponding to the Jewish and Christian Satan, and that, in conformity with Christian ideas, the evil one and his subordinates were only to be execrated and fought against, never to be worshipped or propitiated as in the Hindū system.

Nor did Zoroaster himself, so far as can be proved from the only part of the Avesta assignable to his authorship, ever formulate as part of his religious teaching any precise dogma of an eternal independent existence of two opposing good and evil principles. What he did was to attempt a philosophical explanation of the origin of evil, which afterwards developed into the decided dualism held to be a characteristic of his system. He was an example of a great thinker confronted with a great moral difficulty. Evil existed in the world. How could the allwise eternal Creator be its author, or even permit its existence? With the idea of solving this greatest of all mysteries Zoroaster enunciated a doctrine which, according to learned Pārsīs of the present day, may be thus described. He is believed to have taught that two opposite—but not on that account opposing—principles or forces, which he calls 'Twins,' were inherent in God's Nature, and were set in action by Him, as His appointed mode of maintaining the continuity of the Universe. The one was constructive, the other destructive. One created, moulded, and fashioned, while the other decomposed and disintegrated, but only to co-operate in the act of creation by providing fresh raw material for creative energy. There could be no life without death, no existence without non-existence, just as there could be no light without darkness, no reality without unreality, no truth without falsehood, no good without evil. Such opposites appeared to be involved by some eternal and immutable law of contrast.

Hence the creative force was called Ahura Mazda's beneficent spirit, or 'Spento-Mainyus;' ²² the destructive agency was his maleficent spirit, or 'Angro-Mainyus,' afterwards corrupted into 'Ahriman.' The two principles were only conflicting in name. They were mutually helpful and co-operative. They were essential to the working of

²² Darmesteter interprets this to mean 'beneficent spirit,' but he connects Spenta with the Sanskrit root *Svi*, and considers that it properly means increasing, flourishing. Angra, or Anhra, is connected with the Sanskrit *Anko* (or *Ambas*), evil.

the alternating processes involved in all cosmical being. The only antagonism was between the resulting good and evil, reality and unreality, truth and falsehood, brought about by the free agent man, who could assist or disturb the processes of nature, retard or hasten the operation of the laws of creation and destruction, according to his own free will and election.

How far Zoroastrian influences had affected the religious opinions of the inhabitants of Babylon in the time of the Jewish captivity is doubtful, but that some sort of dualism was confronted and brought into collision with Jewish teaching is probable from Isaiah xlv. 6: 'I am the Lord, and there is none else. I form the light, and create darkness. I make peace and create evil. I, the Lord, do all these things.'

III. The next point for consideration is how Zoroaster's doctrines became affected by the migration of his disciples into Persia.

The same active and enterprising spirit which led the Irano-Āryans to extend their migrations from Balkh to Merv and Herat, impelled them to seek fresh settlements in Persia and Media. Their first advance into those regions took place, in all probability, about the eighth century before Christ. But in Persia and Media, as in India, Pre-Āryan races already occupied the soil. They represented previous waves of migration from Central Asia, though probably from more northern localities. The most important of these earlier occupants of Media and Persia were called Magians. The Dravidians of India were in many respects their counterpart.

Doubtless the first collision of Āryans and Pre-Āryans in Persia, as in India, must have led to frequent hostile encounters. The conflict was not merely one of material interests, but of customs, institutions, and religions. How long the contest was protracted, and with what successes or reverses on either side, can only be matter of conjecture. Nothing certain is to be gathered from the earliest records of that period, except that Iranians and Magians, in the same way as Āryans and Dravidians, ultimately adjusted their differences and settled down together as inhabitants of the same country. Such a compromise could not have been effected without a certain amount of social blending, and a partial interchange of religious thought. The religion of the Magians, too, resembled in many respects the earliest religion of the Iranians. It was a worship of the forces and phenomena of nature, of the sun, moon, and elements, and of all the host of heaven, though its special characteristic appears to have been the cultivation of supernatural (hence called magical) powers. Nothing was more likely than that the mutual attraction of the early religious ideas common to the two races should have facilitated the adulteration of the pure Zoroastrian doctrine by an admixture of Magian superstitions.

In point of fact, the religion of Zoroaster became so blended with

that of the Magians that the two systems were often treated by classical writers as identical. Probably the old lines laid down by Zoroaster would have disappeared altogether had not periodical reformatations restored them to prominence and force. One of the earliest reformatations, as has been recently shown, was effected by Darius Hystaspes. His edicts, preserved in the Achaemenian inscriptions at Behistun—first translated by Sir Henry Rawlinson—bear testimony to his faith in Ahura Mazda. Moreover, the Proto-Median version of the inscriptions,²³ lately translated by Dr. Oppert, contains the earliest extant allusion to the Avesta, and a remarkable record of its restoration after a period of neglect and oblivion. It runs as follows :—

And Darius the King says: I have made also elsewhere a book in the Aryan language, that formerly did not exist. And I have made the text of the Divine Law (*Avesta*), and a commentary of the Divine Law, and the prayer, and the translation. And it was written and I sealed it. And then the ancient book was restored by me in all nations, and the nations followed it.

With the decline of the Persian Empire came another decline of the religion. The invasion of the Greeks led to serious religious persecutions. It is said, indeed, that soon after the conquests achieved by Alexander the Great, Zoroastrianism nearly met with extinction. He is accused, but without good evidence, of having attempted to destroy all its sacred writings. It is certain that they became hopelessly corrupted in his time, and that the introduction of Grecian civilisation and philosophy contributed to the deterioration of the Zoroastrian creed. A long period of trial followed upon Alexander's conquest. Repeated persecutions occurred, and the religion of Zoroaster suffered from neglect and decay for at least five centuries. It is even believed that about the second century of our era, during the rule of the Parthians, a movement was set on foot with a view to the merging of the whole system in Judaism and Christianity. At last, however, with the extinction of the Parthian and the commencement of the Sāsānian dynasty, came a sudden reaction. Under Ardashīr Bābakān about the year 225 of our era, a new Zoroastrian revival was inaugurated; the scattered fragments of the sacred Avesta were collected; Pahlavi²⁴ translations were made for the use of the people who could not understand the ancient

²³ I call this version Proto-Median or Proto-Medic, because to call it Median, as some have done, is wholly misleading. The Medes and Persians belonged to the same Aryan race, and were scarcely more different than the Spanish and Portuguese. The language of this particular inscription is rather that of the Magian and Pre-Aryan races, and is agglutinative like the Proto-Babylonian.

²⁴ Pahlavi, as already explained, was the vernacular of Persia under the Sāsānians. The Pahlavi translations were interlineated with the Avestan text, and these were the proper Zand. It is curious to note how, as the spoken language changed, other translations became necessary. Pārsi translations followed the Pahlavi, and when the Avesta was transferred to India, and Gujarāti became the vernacular of the Pārsis, Gujarāti and even Sanskrit translations had to be made.

Avestan language, and the old religion was once more elevated to the dignity of a State religion.

Doubtless the simplicity of Zoroaster's doctrines had begun to be affected by corruptions and incrustations even before the migration of the Irano-Aryans into Persia. Old superstitions gradually revived, and non-Aryan influences continued to make themselves felt. To follow all the developments and modifications to which in process of time the original creed became subjected would be impossible. Decidedly the first and most important change was the crystallisation of Zoroaster's undefined dualistic ideas into a hard uncompromising dualism. Spento-Mainyus was no longer Ahura Mazda's constructive energy, but another name for Ahura Mazda as the eternal principle of good; and Angro-Mainyus, or Ahriman, was no longer Ahura Mazda's disintegrating energy, but another name for an independent self-existing spirit of evil. Hence Ahura Mazda (written in Persian Ormazd) and Ahriman were converted into two antagonistic principles wholly unconnected and incessantly at war with each other. It was on this account that a party of theologians who disliked a purely dualistic doctrine invented a theory according to which the two opposing principles were both the product of a Supreme Being called *Zarvan Akarana*, Boundless Time.²⁵

The later dualistic phase of Zoroastrianism may be more fully stated as follows:—

Two opposite worlds or counter creations—a good and a bad—proceed from each of the two eternal principles, and each is superintended by a triple gradation of rulers. On the one side there is a celestial hierarchy consisting of the Supreme Being (Ormazd), six chief celestial rulers (*amesha-spentas*) commonly called archangels,²⁶ and innumerable secondary celestial rulers (*yazatas*=Sanskrit *yajata*, adorable), commonly called angels; on the other side, a triple order of demoniacal rulers, consisting of Ahriman, the prince of the devils, six archdemons, and innumerable subordinate spirits of evil.

The six chief celestial rulers coming next to the supreme Ormazd form with Him a supreme council of seven heavenly guardians of the universe. They are called *Vohu-mano*, 'Good Mind,' the source of all good thoughts, words, and deeds; *Asha-vahishta* (corrupted into *Ardi-bahisht*), 'Perfect Rectitude or Purity,' presiding over light and fire; *Khshathra-vairyā*, 'Complete Sovereignty,' ruling especially over metals; *Spenta Armaiti*, 'Sacred Devotion,' presiding over the

²⁵ This theory of a Supreme Being, called Boundless Time—the Creator of Ormazd and Ahriman—was invented during the rule of the Sasanians. It was founded on Vendidad xix. 9 (Westergaard's edition), which simply states that the Supreme Being created the good and the bad spirits *in boundless time*. Haug quotes a Greek writer Damascius, who says, 'The Magi and the whole Aryan nation consider some Space, and others Time, as the universal cause out of which the good god as well as the evil spirit were separated.'

²⁶ The expressions 'archangel' and 'angel,' though convenient, are objectionable; they are by no means equivalents for *Amesha-spentas* and *Yazatas*.

earth; *Haurvatād* and *Ameretād*, 'Health and Immortality' (both in the dual number as always associated). All of these personalities bear the name of Amesha-spentas (corrupted by the Pārsīs into Amshasponds), 'Eternal Benefactors.' They have been developed out of what in the Gāthās are little more than abstract ideas or qualities of the Deity.

Passing on to secondary celestial rulers, called Yazatas (corrupted by the Pārsīs into Yazads or Yezeds or Izads), and generally translated by 'angel,' we have in the first place the whole Zoroastrian system collectively personified and practically deified under the name Sraosh²⁷ or Srosh = Sanskrit Śruti. This divine ruler or presiding angel became in process of time a very important personification in his relation to human beings. He was the saviour or guardian of the whole human race against the calamities with which the demons were ever seeking to overwhelm it. And when in later times the religion of Zoroaster had lapsed into a system not far superior to the polydemonism of the Hindūs and Buddhists, and when the texts, prayers, and ritual of the Avesta (especially of its Vendīdād portion) were employed as magical spells and talismans against the malice of devils, Sraosh was the personification of such texts, prayers, and ritual. But Sraosh is only one of a vast subordinate hierarchy of angels or spiritual rulers. Everything good created by Ormazd and his six celestial assessors is presided over by a Yazata or good spirit. For example, the presiding genius of fire is Athar, called Ātar or Ādar in the later system. Nor is this all, for every being in the good creation is protected by a Fravashi, or guardian angel.²⁸ Such attendant spirits are innumerable. They are held to be of four kinds:²⁹ (1) those of departed heroes, (2) those of future heroes, (3) those of all living men, (4) those of all deceased persons. The fourth class correspond to the Hindū Pitris and classical Manes or spirits of the dead, and, like them, are dependent for strength and nourishment on their living relatives. Divine honour is paid to them at certain ceremonies (resembling the Hindū Śrāddhas), and offerings are presented not only of food, but of clothing.

And now as to the counter-creation which counterbalances the celestial hierarchy. Ahriman is daevanām daevo (devānām devah), the demon of demons. He is formed of darkness and falsehood, and is described as the father of lies. He has under him six arch-fiends,

²⁷ In the later system Ahura Mazda is not reckoned among the seven Amesha-spentas, being superior to them all. Sraosh then becomes the seventh. One of the prayers in the Khordah Avesta makes thirty-three Amesha-Spentas, which harmonises very curiously with the thirty-three gods of the Veda.

²⁸ Zoroaster himself is supposed to have had his fravashi. Not long ago I heard a similar doctrine eloquently preached by a Roman Catholic priest in France. He maintained that homage was due from every man every day towards his attendant spirit, or guardian angel.

²⁹ So at least says the Farvardin Yasht, the longest in the Khordah Avesta.

constituting his chief demoniacal councillors, the first of whom is *Akəm-Mano*, 'evil-mind,' the suggester of men's evil thoughts. The second is the Indian god Indra, the third is Saurva (= the Indian deity Śiva), the fourth is *Nāonhaithya* (= the Indian *Nāsatyas*). The fifth and sixth are personifications of Darkness and Poison.³⁰ Again equally numerous with the angels of the good creation are the demons (*devas*) who preside over everything bad in the counter-creation. Space would fail were we to continue the catalogue: Let it suffice to bear in mind as a comforting reflection that every deva or spirit of evil has more than his match in some opposing yazata or spirit of goodness.

A similar opposition of good and evil is observable in the religions of India. The 330,000,000 gods of the Hindū Pantheon are balanced by a Pandemonium of equally numerous proportions. But in the Hindū system the gods are often worsted in their conflicts with their foes. And, what is still more remarkable, the demons of Hindūism are not necessarily irreligious. They may acquire more than divine power by the practice of religious austerities. Thus the demon Ravana is described as having compelled all the secondary gods to do menial work in his service.

In the religion of Zoroaster, however, as in Christianity, there is a clear recognition of the superiority and ultimate victory of good over evil. No demon is therefore propitiated by offerings as in Hindūism. Nor is the wrath of god or demon appeased by sanguinary sacrifices. Evil spirits must be fought against and overcome; and that, too, by sheer personal effort and hard fighting on the part of each individual doing battle for himself. The true Zoroastrian is never guilty of the imprudence of despising his foe. He is fully alive to the subtlety and cunning of his spiritual adversaries. His whole life is spent in protecting himself against their machinations. He knows that their power of working mischief is greatly enhanced by any impurity of thought, word, or deed. He is taught that in order to be demon-proof a man must be perpetually on his guard against the slightest personal or bodily defilement. He must be diligent in the recitation of certain texts and formularies (*manthra*). He must be careful to wear a sacred shirt (*sadara*), made of linen or some fine white substance to typify purity.³¹ He must gird himself with a sacred white girdle (called *kusti*), coiling it round his body in three coils, tying it round him in a particular manner and with a particular knot, taking it off and restoring it five times a day with the due repetition of particular prayers in the sacred Zend language which he does not understand. If, after all, he should be guilty of any sin of

³⁰ I follow Hang in this enumeration. The principal evil demons are all given in his *Essays*.

³¹ More will be said about the shirt and girdle in describing the customs of the modern Parsis. The sacred shirt corresponds to the under-garment worn by a Jewish child, called *Arbang Kanphoth*.

commission or omission, he must repeat a form of confession to God, part of which is thus translated:—

All that I ought to have thought and have not thought, all that I ought to have said and have not said, all that I ought to have done and have not done, all that I ought not to have thought and yet have thought, all that I ought not to have spoken and yet have spoken, all that I ought not to have done and yet have done; for thoughts, words and works, bodily and spiritual, earthly and heavenly, pray I for forgiveness.

Not that the whole of a Zoroastrian's religion consists in elaborate personal purifications. Fire, earth, and sea are symbolical of various attributes of the Godhead, and must be carefully protected from defilement. Fire must never be contaminated by the breath. It must never be kindled in proximity to the mouth (as, for example, in smoking tobacco). As to mother earth, she must on no account be defiled by contact with impure substances—least of all by dead bodies, which are the most impure of all things. They must be exposed on the top of towers made of solid granite, and erected on high hills. There they must be left to be devoured by birds of prey. All animals which fall under the good creation are to be held in veneration, especially bulls, cows, cocks,³² and dogs. (On the other hand, snakes, frogs, scorpions, mice, and all belonging to the evil creation, are to be destroyed. A dog must be brought to look at a corpse, that its passage over the bridge Chinvat to Paradise may be secured.

Nor must it be forgotten that there exists in Zoroastrianism an elaborate system of religious services and symbolical ceremonies.³³ The highest attributes of the Supreme Being are symbolised by his creations, fire, light, and the sun. Of these, fire is the one most accessible and manageable, and most conveniently isolated in separate localities. Hence worship is conducted by regularly appointed priests dressed in pure white garments, in the presence of sacred fire, or rather with the face turned towards it.³⁴ The fire is first consecrated by solemn formularies, and then maintained day and night in fire-temples by offerings of sandal-wood and other fragrant substances, every attendant priest being required to wear a veil (penom) before his mouth and nostrils. Worship may also be performed in the open air, prayers being repeated with the face turned towards the sun (compare Ezekiel viii. 16), or towards the sea, as objects typical of God's majesty and power. Homage must, of course, be paid to the whole heavenly hierarchy, the very name Yazata meaning 'worthy of worship.' No animals ought ever to be sacrificed; nor is there any image worship. Idolatry, such as is practised by the Hindūs of the

³² The cock is said to be sacred to the angel Sraosh.

³³ Whether Freemasonry has borrowed, as is often asserted, any of its mysticism and symbolism from Zoroastrianism, I must leave Freemasons themselves to decide.

³⁴ Fire, the sun, and the sea, are practically the Zoroastrian's Kiblah, as Mecca is that of the Muhammadans, but in reciting the Ormazd Yasht, or prayer to the Supreme Being, he does not turn his face to any emblem of any kind.

present day, is an abomination to all true Zoroastrians. Yet complicated mystical ceremonies are performed with metal cups and vessels, with consecrated water (Zaothra), with homa (a liquid concocted from a plant substituted for the Indian Soma), with pomegranate leaves, with the sacred twigs or wires³⁵ (called Baresma or Barsom), with the Darūn or consecrated flat cakes offered to angels and deceased persons, and with the liquid excretions of cows and bulls.³⁶

In all such ceremonies, to be more fully described in my next paper, prayers, invocations, and formularies of various kinds are recited, all of which are in Zend and taken from the Avesta.

IV. The limits of the present paper will not admit of my explaining at any length the contents of the sacred Avesta.

The fact is that the Zoroastrian bible is a simple reflection of the natural workings, counter-workings, and inter-workings of the human mind in its earnest strivings after truth, in its eager gropings after more light, in its strange hallucinations, childish vagaries, foolish conceits, and unaccountable inconsistencies. Here and there lofty conceptions of the Deity, deep philosophical thoughts, and a pure morality are discoverable in the Avesta like green spots in a desert; but they are more than neutralised by the silly puerilities and degrading superstitious ideas which crop up as plentifully in its pages as thorns and thistles in a wilderness of sand. Even the most tolerant and impartial student of Zoroastrianism must admit that the religious cravings of humanity can no more be satisfied with such food than a starving man be kept alive by a few grains of good wheat in a cart-load of husks. Happily we are not obliged to resort to the Avesta any more than to the Veda to be spiritually fed, nor yet to be mentally feasted. Our object in studying these ancient documents is to gain an insight into the earliest thoughts and feelings of our Āryan forefathers, to follow the gradual growth of their religious ideas, and to watch the operation of those intellectual, spiritual, and moral forces out of which our own higher civilisation and more refined culture have been slowly and laboriously developed.

An account of the expulsion of the Zoroastrian religion from Persia, and of the modifications it underwent among the Pārsīs of India, must be reserved for a future paper.

MONIER WILLIAMS.

NOTE.—Professor Darmesteter's translation of the Vendidad, with an Introduction, forming one of the *Sacred Books of the East*, has been published since this paper was written, but has not led me to alter or modify any of the opinions I have here expressed.—M.W.

³⁵ In the present day metal wires are used for the Barsom, which ought properly to consist of slender twigs cut from a particular tree. These appear to be alluded to in Ezekiel viii. 17.

³⁶ This is called Nirang, and thought to have a very purifying effect.

•

*THE BASUTOS AND THE CONSTITUTION
OF THE CAPE OF GOOD HOPE.*

PUBLIC attention is at present so exclusively devoted to Ireland that there is less chance than usual of much thought being given by our statesmen and public writers to other parts of the British dominions. South Africa is, meanwhile, passing through a crisis as momentous to the fortunes of our colonies as that which occasions so much anxiety in Ireland, and there is considerable danger of changes, which may be very serious and very disastrous in their consequences, being effected in our relations with our South African possessions, before many on this side the ocean are at all aware of what is being done.

Since the late Governor was recalled, the extreme members of the party in England who had so persistently demanded his recall as the one thing needed to restore peace and prosperity to South Africa have changed their cry. They now demand the forcible intervention of the Home Government to suspend the Constitution granted eight years ago to the Cape Colony, to take the administration of native affairs in South Africa under the direct control of the Secretary of State, and to revert to the worst features of that form of government which kept the Cape Colony for so many years in continual hot water, occasioned a constant succession of Kaffir wars, and a steady annexation of Kaffir territory. This retrograde and cruel policy is urged on her Majesty's Government by extreme sections of the Liberal and humanitarian parties—by men who, if they knew the real facts of the case and the real tendency of the measures they propose, would be the last to countenance a course which must prove alike fatal to the liberties and development of the European colonies, and to the chances of any steady improvement of the native races in civilisation or the arts of peace.

The deputation which lately waited on Lord Kimberley to advocate the course I have described, received from the Secretary of State little in the way of encouragement to their designs on the liberties of

their fellow-subjects at the Cape; but the persistent misapprehension and misrepresentation of facts which has already been the cause of so much mischief still continues, and the advocates of a change in the Cape Constitution may now refer for support to two articles in the *Nineteenth Century* of April 1879 and December 1880, as affording them the countenance of the most experienced philosophical statesmanship and of the highest political morality.

Believing that these articles could not have been written had the real facts of the case been known, I propose to state those facts as they will, I am sure, be found by any one who has the means and the will to investigate them. I propose to confine my remarks for the present to the Basuto rebellion. I believe that an equally strong case could be made out with regard to the Kaffir wars of 1877 and 1878, and the later Zulu war; but the Basuto question is less complicated by side issues; it is a more complete test of the power of the Colonial Government and of the way in which that Government is likely to use its powers; and, above all, it is used, as the last and most conclusive argument, by those who would withdraw or contract and control the powers of self-government which the Cape Colony now possesses.

It seems generally supposed, by English writers and speakers on the subject, that the Basutos are an ancient race of mountaineers long settled in their present country, and for many generations past in the enjoyment of freedom, and conspicuous for their loyalty and attachment to the British Crown. This, however, is far from being the case. Under their present name, and in their present position, the Basutoland Basutos have no history beyond the memory of many men still living. They, in fact, owe their existence as a separate community, their name, and their position, entirely to their old and able chief Moshesh, who, less than twelve years ago, handed himself and his people over to the British Government, to save them from utter destruction and dispersion. The Basutos have, in fact, only come to what we now call Basutoland within the last generation. Within living memory, before Chaka created the military organisation of the Zulus, most of the clans of Bechuanas now settled in Basutoland lived in the open country, north of the Orange River, between the twenty-second and twenty-eighth degrees of south latitude and the twenty-second to twenty-ninth degrees of east longitude. The Bechuanas were more civilised and peaceful than the Zulus and other Kaffir tribes between the Drakensburg and the sea, and Basutoland had then few human tenants save Bushmen.

Early in the century the growing Zulu power disturbed tribes far inland from the present Zulus. Among the more civilised and peaceful Bechuana tribes then inhabiting the Transvaal, was a small clan ruled by the widow of a chief, who had for her counsellor Moshesh, a natural statesman and general. Moshesh first of all shared,

and eventually superseded, the authority of his chieftainess, made himself independent, and attracted to his rule many of the broken clans who had been ruined by intestine wars, or who were flying before the advancing hordes of Moselakatze, the emigrant Zulu chief. On the other side of the Bechuanas, advancing from the south-west, were the forerunners of the great Boer emigration from the Cape Colony. Retiring before these adverse forces, Moshesh sought refuge in Basutoland, which was then inhabited by few but the aboriginal Bushmen of the country. Here, in comparative peace, he consolidated his power, his people settled down in the deep valleys and multiplied, drawing to them many fugitives from all quarters, and over these Moshesh ruled with much wisdom and sagacity.

But his people, who had grown in lawlessness, did not give up the predatory habits they had acquired during their wanderings. They stole cattle, got into trouble with their neighbours on every side, and when Sir George Cathcart, just before the Crimean war, was settling the country which now forms the frontier districts of the Cape Colony and Orange Free State, he found it necessary to organise an expedition to bring Moshesh and his cattle-stealing people to account. Moshesh sent messengers and sued for peace. When a friendly chief remonstrated with Moshesh he replied, with characteristic sagacity, that 'he could have driven the redcoats then before him into the sea; but he knew that ten times their number would come out of the sea, and eventually destroy him; hence he was convinced that the best use he could make of the strong position he held was to secure peace and the goodwill of his powerful English neighbours.'

The peace which Sir George Cathcart accorded to him was in every way most advantageous, and might have secured the content, prosperity, and independence of his country; but the predatory habits of the Basutos were not so easily checked, and, after a while, brought about hostilities with the Orange Free State; which, meantime, had grown up between the Basutos and the Vaal River. In this contest the Basutos were effectually worsted; and the persistent courage of the Free State Boers under their able President Brand reduced Moshesh to the last extremity. The Boers were besieging his stronghold, and must have starved him out, when Moshesh, advised by the French Protestant missionaries who had settled in his country, appealed to the English Government to save him. He opened negotiations both with Sir Philip Wodehouse, the Governor of the Cape Colony, and with the Lieutenant-Governor of Natal, who was, at the time, in an almost independent position. With much natural diplomatic skill Moshesh tried to gain the best terms he could by playing off the one English Government against the other, and both against the Orange Free State. Finally, he decided to ask to be annexed to the Cape, mainly because he thought he could,

under the Cape Government, retain the few firearms his people had acquired; whereas he knew that, if he submitted to Natal, they would have to be surrendered in accordance with the laws of that colony.

The people of the Orange Free State were naturally indignant at being prevented from completing operations which would have given them the sovereignty over their troublesome neighbours and added largely to the territorial resources of the State; but their remonstrances were unheeded. The Secretary of State had at first regarded the acceptance of the Basutos as British subjects with anything but favour; he, however, yielded to the arguments of Sir Philip Wodehouse, and the Basutos were eventually accepted as British subjects in 1868, and two years afterwards were formally annexed by legislative enactment to the old Cape Colony, whose fortunes they have since shared.

When responsible government was granted to the Cape Colony eight years ago, the Basutos, like all other inhabitants of the colony, whether of European or native origin, came under the authority of the colonial Ministers, responsible to the Cape Parliament.

Moshesh appears to have accepted his position as a British subject with as much equanimity as could be expected from a man who had all his life been more or less of an autocrat. In public, he was always profuse in his expressions of conviction that nothing could stand against the English power; and constantly exhorted his children and subordinate chiefs, whatever they did, never to quarrel with or attempt to resist the English Government. He died a few years ago, leaving his country divided into four portions. Three were assigned to his sons. Letsea, the eldest, was an indolent, unenterprising man, and appears generally to have acquiesced in the wisdom of his father's advice to keep on good terms with the English.

Not so, however, his half-brother Masupha. He had always aspired to lead the reactionary party—men who preferred Basuto ways to English ways—who longed for their old independence and license to sweep off their neighbours' cattle, and who lent a ready ear to all proposals for expelling the white man, and reverting to the old days of unfettered native rule. He found ready followers in many of the young men as they grew up, including some of Letsea's sons and other grandsons of Moshesh.

Molappo, the third sharer in the inheritance which Moshesh bequeathed to his sons, appears to have taken the same view as his father did, and submitted to British rule as an inevitable necessity, without much liking for European ways in the abstract.

The fourth share in the country which Moshesh surrendered to English rule was in the possession of a chief named Morosi, who was not of near kin to the other Basuto tribes, and who paid little more than a nominal allegiance to Moshesh. Morosi's people were the most backward and uncivilised of all the Basuto clans.

From their earliest intercourse with European traders, the Basutos had had more or less opportunity of possessing themselves of European firearms. It might be supposed that when they had killed off all the game which formerly abounded in the unpopulated country they occupied, and when they were secured against aggressions from the Orange Free State, the Basutos, who had a natural turn for industrial arts and civilisation, would have given up their habit of acquiring firearms whenever they could purchase them; but no such result followed. When the discovery of the Diamond Fields presented a new and accessible field for private labour, the Basutos flocked thither, earning large wages, of which a portion was invariably invested in a gun of some kind. It has since been ascertained that this habit of acquiring firearms was less often due to personal taste on the part of the labourer, than to the injunction, which he always received from his chief when he got leave to go to the Diamond Fields, that he should not return to Basutoland without a gun and as much ammunition as he could purchase. The object of the injunction was not, at the time, apparent. The Basutos, when asked, gave a variety of frivolous reasons. 'A gun was a mark of manhood and a piece of personal ornament especially becoming a nation of mountain warriors.' In vain the authorities of the Orange Free State and the Transvaal Republics remonstrated upon the subject with the English authorities of the Diamond Fields and the old colony. The gun, as a part of the labourer's wages, attracted labourers when nothing else would, and a variety of ingenious arguments were invented to prove that nothing was to be apprehended from the general acquisition of arms by all native tribes. 'The natives,' it was said, 'would not know how to use their guns—they would speedily rust and become useless, and a native with a gun was much less formidable than the native with only an assegai.' The experience of the last three years has sternly refuted all these arguments, and has shown that the acquisition of firearms is as great an addition to the fighting-power of the Kaffir, as it was in earlier days to the archers and pikemen of Europe.

Moshesh had been dead two or three years when the war with Kreli broke out in the Cape Colony. There is clear proof that in earlier days Moshesh kept up an active intercourse with Kreli and the chiefs of Kaffraria, with Cetewayo and his Zulus, and Secucuni and his Basutos, but no symptoms of *active* sympathy had been observed among the Basutos before the war with Kreli came to an end.

When the Zulu war broke out, many men who were acquainted with the Basutos in former days, were prophesying that disturbances on the Basuto border were imminent; others, equally experienced, affirmed that the Basutos were loyal to the British Government, and had incurred the lasting enmity of the Zulus by surrendering Langalibaleli. However, nothing occurred to test their loyalty till Morosi, whose son had been imprisoned for the third or fourth case

of horse-stealing of which he had been accused, released his son from prison, took to the mountains, and set up the standard of revolt. This rebellion was not put down till a large colonial force had been moved into his country at great expense, and many lives had been lost.

I would note, in passing, that there is little, if any, foundation for the praise which has been bestowed on the Basutos generally for their loyalty and good behaviour during the war with Krelu in 1877 and with Cetewayo and his Zulus in 1879. It is quite true that certain Basutos, from Natal, joined the other Natal native contingents in the Zulu war, and did excellent service; but these Basutos had nothing to do with Basutos in Basutoland. They were as distinct as Secucuni's Basutos, several hundred miles to the north-east of Basutoland. The undoubted good behaviour of these Natal Basutos proves nothing whatever regarding the general fidelity or loyalty of the race elsewhere.

Morosi's rebellion convinced the Government of the Cape that it would no longer be safe to delay extending to Basutoland the enactments already in force in the Cape Colony, which made it penal to carry arms without a license. This determination was officially announced to the Basutos by Mr. Sprigg, the Parliamentary Minister of the Cape Colony, in person, at a 'Pitso,' or general assembling of the Basuto tribes, held in Basutoland in September 1879. The object and scope of the measure were very fully explained at the time, both by Mr. Sprigg and Colonel Griffith, the Governor's Agent, who was in charge of the administration of Basutoland. From that period, till the Disarming Act was finally proclaimed in May 1880, the subject was one of constant discussion between the magistrates in Basutoland, the Basuto chiefs and people, and the French Protestant missionaries settled in Basutoland.

The French Protestant missionaries have taken a very active part against the Cape Government throughout the discussions on this question, and have done more perhaps than any other body to excite public opinion in England and the feelings of the Basutos against the Cape Ministry. It is necessary, therefore, to say a few words regarding the weight which should be attached to their opinions on the political and administrative questions before us.

It was not till some time after the Basutos had been officially informed by the Prime Minister of the Colony that the colonial laws regarding the carriage of arms would be applied to Basutoland, that one of the French missionaries sent me a strongly worded remonstrance against the measure. In the long discussions which followed, I can testify that the most careful attention was given by the Governor and his Ministers to the arguments brought forward, but they appeared singularly weak.

It was argued that:

(1) 'The measure was unnecessary; the Basutos were and had always been loyal, and would never make a bad use of their firearms.'

To this it was replied that the recent example of Moresi proved the contrary, and established the soundness of the opinion of the Cape Ministry, the responsible advisers of the Crown, that it would not be consistent with the public safety to allow the indiscriminate carriage of arms by unlicensed persons even in Basutoland.

(2) 'It was unjust and inconsistent. The Basutos had been allowed formerly and even encouraged to purchase arms, and they had done so with their own money, and it was unjust, and an interference with the rights of private property, to require them to surrender those arms.'

To this it was replied that there could be no doubt there had been formerly much laxity in permitting the indiscriminate purchase of arms; and there was some ground for the assertion that encouragements had been offered to Basutos to work in the Diamond Fields and railways in the old colony by permitting them to purchase guns *ad libitum*; but that this carelessness or want of forethought on the part of officials in the old colony and at the Diamond Mines in former days, could not fetter the subsequent action of the Cape Government when it found the indiscriminate possession of arms constituted a danger to the public peace in any given district. That the law made provision for the purchase of arms at their full value by Government from all who were required to surrender them; that no necessity could be pleaded for their retention, since there was no game to kill, nor enemies to oppose. That the executive Government was the only competent judge of the necessity of such measures, which were justifiable on the same grounds which justify interference with the unfettered use of private property in the case of spirits or poisons or dangerous explosives, or other articles offered for sale. That the public safety was the supreme object to be attended to; and that, provided adequate money compensation were given, there was no ground for complaint on the score of interference with private property.

(3) Subsidiary to objections of the class just noticed were others, such as the suspicions of the Basutos that the Government of the Cape intended to disarm them, then to seize their lands, children, and cattle, and to hand them over to destruction by the Boers of the Orange Free State. Such objections were obviously so absurd in themselves that they were only regarded as appeals for delay, and further explanation, for which ample time was given. A similar objection was the exorbitant price often paid by a Basuto for guns which, when fairly valued, would leave him a loser even if the compensation were liberally calculated.

(4) But the most frequent and potent class of objections were connected with the feelings of the Basutos. It was said, 'they had

always been used to carry arms; arms were to them a mark of dignity and manliness. To deprive them of their arms was an insult, and degraded them in a manner in which no spirited people could be expected to submit.'

To this it was replied that, as firearms were of entirely modern introduction into Basutoland, as Basutos had for the most part acquired them only since they became British subjects, no such custom could be pleaded for their retention and display on all public occasions and great meetings. That firearms could not be regarded as necessary marks of dignity or manliness by a European Government, whose great men and rulers, like all the population, went about unarmed. That, for any satisfactory purposes, such as the destruction of game or wild beasts, the law provided for the granting of licenses to the Basutos as in England and other civilised countries.

This last class of objections was that most frequently and persistently urged. Of course, in a matter of feeling and sentiment, it was not to be expected that simple reasoning would have much weight, and the result of the discussions was always a conviction on the part of the officers of the Government, that there were reasons far more potent than sentiment and feeling, rendering the Basutos unwilling to part with their arms. I do not for a moment suppose that the French pastors had any suspicion of such undisclosed objections to the measure which the Government thought necessary in the interests of public peace. But reliance on the judgment of the missionaries in such secular matters was much weakened by the extraordinary want of accurate information regarding the constitutional status of Basutoland evinced by the French pastors when they came to discuss the legal aspects of the proposed measure.

In judging of the weight to be given to the opinions adverse to disarmament which were laid before the Cape Government by the French Protestant missionaries, it should be borne in mind that, admirable as were these gentlemen in every spiritual relation, they were unworldly men, living secluded lives in a remote province—no way responsible for its civil government. In such a case, where, at first sight, no question of moral right or wrong appears to be involved, the pastors will naturally side with the popular rather than the unpopular view. They are necessarily very imperfectly acquainted with practical politics and civil administration, and strongly biassed in favour of their pupils, whom they have rescued from utter barbarism, and whose progress in civilisation they are very naturally not inclined to under-estimate. To advocate the enforcement of an unpopular law, however necessary to public safety, is a severe trial to moral influence. Events have shown that the missionaries were utterly mistaken as to the motives of the Basutos for wishing to retain their guns, useless as they were for any legal purpose. Whilst the missionaries believed that the Basutos were actuated by no worse

motive than a harmless vanity, the conduct of the insurgent leaders and their followers has shown that they never meditated and would never willingly acquiesce in anything less than the substitution of unfettered native rule in place of colonial law. It may be doubted whether the spiritual pastors of an uncivilised race are always the soundest advisers regarding the civil government of their flocks. In the present case their advice to abstain from any action distasteful to their congregations was further weakened by the absence of any alternative suggestion. The missionaries could not deny the great danger of the new fashion which had become so popular in a vain and impulsive race just emerging from barbarism—a fashion which led every labourer to invest his savings in buying the best firearms he could purchase. But as regards any measures for meeting the danger, the missionaries had no more to suggest than practically to fold the hands and await events. It can hardly be matter of surprise that such advice did not commend itself to practical men responsible to the Colonial Parliament for the preservation of peace and for the safety of life and property in that and the neighbouring provinces.

But though the arguments of the Government did not avail much in securing the concurrence of the French missionaries, the Ministry finally resolved to take no active measures till the subject had been formally discussed in the Cape Parliament. The missionaries applied to send down a representative with Basuto delegates to be present at the debate. This request was cordially granted, and the Rev. M. Cochet, attended by a number of Basuto chiefs and councillors, came to Cape Town, and was present throughout the debate. It was impossible to have done more to secure for their arguments a fair hearing. M. Cochet was a French scholar and a gentleman of ability; and though on his first arrival at Cape Town the machinery of a constitutional government was obviously new to him, he soon acquired an intelligent appreciation of the situation, and when the debate concluded in a manner which showed that the Parliament was resolved to support the Ministry to carry out the Disarming Acts, he and his fellow-delegates accepted the inevitable conclusion, and expressed their hopes that, if the execution of the measure were not hurried, it might be carried through without serious opposition, and they returned to Basutoland promising to use to the utmost their influence for a peaceful solution of the difficulty.

I would now say a few words regarding the altered position of all questions regarding the defence of the Cape Colony against native disturbances, which induced the Cape Ministry to regard the measure of disarmament as imperatively necessary. It is now some years since the colonists were first informed that it was the settled purpose of the English Government to maintain in the Cape Colony only such troops as were necessary for the defence of the Cape Penin-

sula, and the naval stations at Table Bay and Simon's Bay. But two regiments, with a proportion of artillery, were left available in case of need for any service which might be required in or beyond the colony. They were disposable according to the judgment of the Governor, who was likewise Commander-in-Chief; though the active command of all military forces, when in the field, was vested in the general officer commanding her Majesty's forces, local and regular, in South Africa.

When the war with Kreli unexpectedly broke out in 1877, both regiments and all the disposable artillery were moved to the frontier, and the Transkei war and Gaika rebellion were arrested by the joint efforts of her Majesty's regular and colonial forces, under the command successively of Generals Sir Arthur Cunnyngame and Sir Frederick Thesiger, now Lord Chelmsford.

To render available the services of these regular troops, great efforts had to be made by the Cape Ministry of Mr. Sprigg, who had become the Premier during the course of the war, and all the usual garrison duties at Cape Town and Simon's Bay were taken for many months during the latter part of the war by volunteers and colonial forces.

At the conclusion of the Transkei operations, in 1878, her Majesty's Government reiterated their injunctions that the colony should prepare to defend itself against all native enemies within the colony, and should for this purpose organise a sufficient colonial force. To those injunctions Mr. Sprigg's Government and the Colonial Legislature readily and heartily responded. They passed Acts making legislative provisions for raising four descriptions of colonial forces—a permanent armed and mounted regular military body (the Cape Mounted Rifles), a force of volunteers of all arms, a force of Yeomanry, and an organised burgher militia.

To provide means for paying these forces, they imposed new taxes, including house tax and excise duties, and did everything else they saw necessary for organising an efficient local force, to an extent which elicited the cordial approval of her Majesty's Government.¹

The action of the Colonial Government was, in every way, aided and supported by Sir Arthur Cunnyngame and Lord Chelmsford, the

¹ Captain Mills, the able Under Colonial Secretary of the Cape Colony, gives the following estimate of the present strength of the colonial forces:—

Cape Mounted Riflemen	1,000
Yeomanry mounted	800
Volunteers of all arms	3,500

These are all of European races, drilled and equipped as regular soldiers.

Burgher Militia less perfectly drilled and equipped	30,000
Levies	15,000

With a small force of armed and mounted police about 200 strong on the Northern (Orange River) Border: .

generals in command of her Majesty's forces ; but before the new colonial forces could be organised, the Zulu war broke out, a great disaster befell our army in Zululand, and there was urgent need for reinforcements in Natal. The Cape Government without hesitation concurred in the transfer to Natal of both her Majesty's regiments, and of all the available artillery which had just returned to their usual quarters in the old colony, and undertook to provide for every military duty (including that of the garrison at Cape Town and Simon's Bay) with colonial forces, as they had done during the Transkei war just concluded. They also sent large bodies of colonial volunteers to the assistance of their fellow-colonists in Natal and Zululand.

When the Zulu war was ended, the question arose what in future, in time of peace, should be the force of her Majesty's regiments within the Cape Colony, and where should they be posted ? The Colonial Ministry, having already accepted the principle of colonial self-defence laid down by her Majesty's Government, consented to the withdrawal from the Kaffraria frontier of the regular force stationed there, and undertook to make permanent provision for frontier duties on the line of the Kei by means of colonial troops only.

But her Majesty's Government went much further than this, and laid down additional restrictions on the employment of her Majesty's forces in the colony. The Governor had requested the aid of a military officer of experience, whom he might depute as a member of a Commission to visit Pondoland—to inquire into disputed questions of boundary and jurisdiction which had, for many years past, been causes of unrest and threatened war between the Pondos and their neighbours. The Governor's request was, however, refused by Sir Garnet Wolseley, on the ground that the questions at issue between the Pondos and their neighbours were merely police cases, in the disposal of which he would not allow any one under his orders to take part without express orders from her Majesty's Government.

Her Majesty's Government upheld and confirmed this refusal, and the principle was thenceforward authoritatively laid down that under no circumstances should any officer or man of her Majesty's forces in South Africa be placed at the disposal of the Colonial Government, or be moved to take part in suppressing any native disturbances without the previously obtained special sanction of her Majesty's Government ; and since then this principle has been specially reaffirmed with reference to the Basuto rebellion.

This was an entirely new principle, and had never before been advanced by her Majesty's Government, or contemplated by the Colonial Government. It placed the relations between the Cape Ministry and her Majesty's forces in a position essentially different from that which they had previously occupied. The principle was, however, frankly accepted by the Colonial Ministry, who undertook the

management of the very difficult Basuto question, subject to the new and onerous conditions thus imposed on them.

No argument is necessary to show how greatly the difficulty of the task of self-defence which had been undertaken by the colony was increased by these new and unlooked-for restrictions. Whenever the Governor, in accordance with the instructions of Her Majesty's Government, had, on previous occasions, urged the colony to undertake its own defence against native enemies, he and the Colonial Ministry had always contemplated a backbone of Her Majesty's regular forces in reserve, ready at once to aid the colonial force in any case of great emergency, and to give help as instructors, critics, and directors towards rendering the colonial force efficient.

The Colonial Ministers were not men to shrink from any obvious duty because it was not easy of performance. But the additional difficulties thus imported into their task strongly confirmed their previous conviction of the imperative necessity of disarming all native tribes, including the Basutos.

By processes already described, the Basutos had become much more formidable than they were when their old chief Moshesh offered such formidable resistance to a well-commanded and very efficient force of regular British troops. The Basutos have since that time greatly increased in numbers, in organisation, in the possession of horses and firearms of the best description. They could on any occasion muster, at a few days' notice, thousands of warriors, mounted on hardy ponies, and armed with assegai lances, excellent European firearms, and amply supplied with ammunition. They held a very strong mountainous district in a very central position, enabling them to descend at will into Natal, the Orange Free State, Kaffraria, or the Cape Colony. They had no legitimate cause for their new fashion of accumulating firearms, and perfecting a military organisation, which was a standing menace to the colony and to the peace of Basutoland. The Cape Ministry took a common-sense and obvious view of this new fashion—that it was dangerous to the peace of the country, and evidence of the Basutos' intention to use their arms at a convenient season, to regain the independence they had lost.

The events of the last six months have conclusively shown that the Cape Ministry were right in this view, that the danger was a very great and pressing one, and that the real object of the Basutos in wishing to retain their firearms was a desire to take advantage of any opportunity which might offer to shake off the yoke of the British Government.

In estimating the action of the Cape Government at this period, it is necessary to bear in mind what was the nature of the disarming measures which it was proposed to enforce in Basutoland.

The provisions of the Acts of the Cape Legislature on these

subjects had been generally copied from the Irish Disarming Acts passed of late years by her Majesty's Government in England. The Acts and the orders of Government regarding their enforcement provided for the purchase at a fair valuation of all arms voluntarily surrendered before a given day; also for the issue of licenses to all who could show good cause for carrying arms; and the instructions of Government peremptorily forbade any domiciliary search for arms by police or magistrates without fresh precise orders from the Government. The measure, in fact, might have been more properly described as 'An Act for regulating the carrying of arms, providing for the registration of arms, and preventing the carriage of arms by unlicensed persons,' rather than as a measure of disarmament, and when properly explained and understood, I have met no reasonable man, either European or Basuto, who objected to the measure in the abstract, or who had any more reasonable objection to urge against it, than that the time of its introduction was inopportune.²

The gravest objections to the course taken by the Cape Government are, however, grounded on an opinion recorded by Sir Garnet Wolseley in a despatch he addressed to the Secretary of State on the 10th of March, 1880. It is a strong protest against the whole policy of disarmament, founded on the great number of natives in South Africa who now possess arms, and the certainty that the attempt to take the arms from them would be resisted, and might lead to a war of races which would extend throughout the whole of South Africa, from Cape Agulhas to the Zambesi.

Unfortunately this protest was never forwarded to the Cape Government till after it had been sent to her Majesty's Government at home, and had been published to the world in a Blue Book in May. It thus failed to reach the Cape Government at the time when it might have been of use, and only arrived some months after it was written, in time to embarrass the action of the Cape Government and detract from the authority of its decision.

Nevertheless the objections stated by the accomplished general were very anxiously weighed by the Cape Government. But, though the dangers of disarmament were very forcibly set forth in the despatch, no alternative was suggested, and the decision already formally ratified by her Majesty's Government that her Majesty's troops should not be employed in supporting the Colonial Government in any such measure as disarmament, effectually precluded the only alternative which might have suggested itself, that the General, who so forcibly depicted the danger to the public peace, occasioned by the undesirable armament of native tribes, should be ready with his troops to protect the colonists whose lives and property were at stake, from the fully armed hordes around them in the colony.

² For further reference on the subject of disarmament in Basuto and see Blue Book C-2569 on South Africa, pp. 6, 17, 38, 43, and 47.

‘What,’ it may fairly be asked, ‘could an intelligent and honest Cape Ministry be expected to do under the circumstances?’ They judged, and, as events have proved, rightly judged, that the general possession of arms was desired by the Basutos to enable them to defy the law, and to assert their independence of the Colonial Government. They knew that the real question at issue, as truly stated by Bishop Callaway, was the struggle between civilisation and barbarism—a contest between the authority of the law, and lawless submission to the will of barbarian chiefs; that every month increased the danger both of the existing state of things, and of applying any possible remedy. What under such circumstances was the best and most patriotic course for the Cape Ministry to pursue?

I submit that it could be none other than that which they did pursue: to uphold, at all risks, law and order; to enforce the law, and to protect the lives and property of all loyal subjects. It is this they have determined to do; it is this they are now doing; and I submit that in this they are entitled to the sympathy of every right-minded Englishman.

The Colonial Government, however, wisely abstained from hurrying on the measure necessary for colonial defence. They allowed the most ample time to discuss and explain its provisions to the people affected. Every argument against the measure was heard and carefully debated in the Colonial Parliament in the presence of the Basuto delegates, and every precaution was taken that arms voluntarily surrendered should be adequately paid for, that no domiciliary police visits in search of arms should be permitted, and that all who could give good reason for carrying arms should receive a license to possess and carry them. The Prime Minister, Mr. Sprigg, himself went up to Basutoland to assist the local authorities; but before he arrived there the malcontent reactionary party had thrown off the mask. Considerable numbers of Basutos, including Letsea, Moshesh’s successor, his nephews, the sons of Molappo, whose influence extended over the north quarter of Basutoland, and many others, declared their intention of obeying the law, and voluntarily surrendering their guns for payment; and many, including Letsea himself, sent in their guns for valuation and payment—all who thus indicated their intention to obey the law were, however, instantly attacked by the malcontents. Letsea’s own guns were stopped on their way to the magistrate’s office, and taken back by some disloyal members of his own family. In some cases, natives who were obeying, or who prepared to obey the law, were killed; many more saved their lives by flight, but at the sacrifice of their cattle and their property; the rebels drove away and intimidated all who declared themselves willing to obey Letsea or the Colonial Government; they occupied the roads, passes, and fields, warned off all who did not belong to their party, plundered tradesmen’s stores;

beleaguered some of the magistrate's stations, and warned them that, unless they evacuated the country, they would be expelled or massacred.

There has been much misrepresentation relative to the advice which Ministers received on this subject from Colonel Commandant Griffith, who has so long, and with so much credit, filled the office of Governor's Agent and Chief Magistrate of Basutoland. It was the earnest desire of the Colonial Government to give every weight to his experienced opinions, and to guide their operations as far as possible by his advice. Colonel Griffith was fully alive to the gravity of the task before the Government, and was always an advocate of cautious procedure; but he acquiesced in each successive step which was taken, and on the 18th of August last reported that many of the influential chiefs were in 'open rebellion,' that 'armed bands of robbers, acting under the orders of their chiefs, have shot down loyal British subjects who were defending their lives and property,' and 'plundered many other loyal natives;' that the object of the disaffected chiefs was 'not only to intimidate and prevent the people from surrendering their arms,' but 'to force the wavering and weak into their ranks;' 'that the authority of Government has been opposed, defied, and trampled on,' and that 'all law and order have for some time been in abeyance.'

'It is very evident,' he adds, 'that the crisis through which we are passing is an endeavour on the part of some of the chiefs to re-establish their arbitrary power, and, if possible, regain their independence.'

Some of the chiefs, in order to show their determination not to restore the cattle plundered from loyal natives, had, Colonel Griffith was informed, killed every head of the plundered cattle, down to the small calves.

Under these circumstances Colonel Griffith strongly urged the immediate assemblage of a large force as the only means of restoring order; and concluded with the expression of his conviction that 'the war party will increase if they are suffered to set our authority at defiance.'

All this, be it remembered, was done before a single step of any kind had been taken by the Cape Government, beyond giving notice that the law should be carried out. No arms had been searched for; only those voluntarily brought in were received and paid for; not a single policeman had been employed to search for or collect arms, or to enforce penalties, nor was a single English volunteer or soldier moved into the province to support the local Basuto police.

The rebels had thus openly defied the law, and asserted their intention of taking the government of the country out of the hands of the local magistrates, and of managing it themselves according to their own will, in defiance of the Colonial Government.

Is it possible that opinions can vary as to what was the duty of the Cape Government under such circumstances?

Mr. Sprigg and his colleagues, supported by the very strongly expressed general opinion of the colony, took an old-fashioned view of their duties, and determined to uphold and enforce the law, to protect life and property as far as they could, and not to permit the government of the country to be wrested from them by rebel leaders.

At first Mr. Sprigg, who arrived on the spot after the rebellion had broken out, did not despair of restoring the authority of law with the aid of the well-disposed Basuto chiefs and their followers. Letsea had been weak and supine in asserting his own authority as chief native stipendiary administrator within his own quarter of Basutoland. But, roused to action by Mr. Sprigg's exhortations, he seemed at first in a fair way of succeeding in doing so. He assembled a force of about a thousand men, marched up and occupied Thaba Bosigo, the old mountain stronghold of Moshesh, and there summoned a general meeting of Basutos. His son Lerothodi, after much vapouring, promised submission to his father's authority. Masupha, who attended with about 800 armed followers, did not actually resist Letsea; and Mr. Sprigg, regarding the rebel leaders as to some extent the victims of bad European advisers, promised that, if they submitted, and returned the cattle and other property they had plundered from their peaceful fellow-subjects and neighbours, they should be absolved from past offences, on payment of a fine and on acknowledging the principle of disarmament by the surrender of a few guns from each petty chief.

Masupha's answer was characteristic, and showed beyond all doubt the spirit which animated the rebel leaders. He declined to discuss restoration of the cattle he had plundered from those who had given up their guns for payment, unless the guns they had surrendered were first returned *to him*, on the ground that they were the property, not of the owner who had purchased and paid for them with the wages of his own labour—and had always retained them—but of himself as chief.

How the rebellion spread, and what were the motives which actuated the rebels, is graphically described by a petty border chief, who, on the 3rd of November last, applied for protection to the magistrate of Barkly, a district bordering on Basutoland.

'I do not know why my people rebelled; some did not wish to rebel, others were forced into it. . . . I could control my men until Galalie came about seven days ago to M'Jakana's kraal. . . . These men ordered all my cattle to be taken, three hundred head and thirteen horses. I came out on foot. They threatened to kill me because they said I was not sacking shops and murdering white men like the rest. I remonstrated with them, and that is why I am here to-day. . . . I tried to find out some time ago from Gecelo, Mantanzima, Bomvana and Sequingato what they were

going to do, but they said I was a white man. They would not tell me more than that they were going to sack shops. When these men heard Tyali was fighting, they said, "Good again, let him fight." "Now is our time to join and drive the white man out." Long ago, before the fighting, Letsea sent word to the chiefs they must be ready to fight. The Tambookies have no grievance. They simply fight because they hate the white man. The chiefs said a lot, but you cannot believe them; they lie, and then go and kill the Government. I came out with eleven followers. I fought against Government in the war "Umlangeni," and then I said we could never win, and I have been loyal ever since.'

Opposed to such a spirit, no concessions which Mr. Sprigg could offer could possibly be effectual. Letsea, after a few days, whether from weakness or treachery, evacuated Thaba Bosigo, and the rebels resumed their old position, threatening, plundering, and driving out of the province all who did not join them, and beleaguering the magistrates who stood on the defensive in their head-quarter stations. All hope of reasonable compromise being thus lost, Mr. Sprigg summoned from distant quarters such reinforcements of Cape Mounted Rifles as could be assembled, to rescue and support the magistrates; and the troops, when moving for this purpose, were waylaid and attacked by large masses of well-armed and determined rebels directly they entered Basutoland.

I have heard it said by those who admit that the prime duty of a government is to support law and protect the lives and property of the loyally disposed, that the Government should have collected adequate forces on the frontier of Basutoland before proclaiming that a measure of disarmament would be enforced. It ought, therefore, to be here noted that the delay in bringing forward such forces as could be collected to support the law in Basutoland was a concession to the entreaties of many friends of the Basutos, including some of the missionaries and of professedly loyal persons among the Basutos themselves. They urged that the actually disloyal party formed a very small proportion of the whole tribe; that the rebels hoped for support from the ignorance and absurdly groundless fears of many of their fellow-tribesmen, and that, if no force were displayed, the ignorant and timid might be instructed and reassured, and the measure of disarmament carried out without difficulty.

Since that date every effort has been made by the Colonial Ministry to do its duty in supporting law and the authority of the local Government; all available forces have been moved up; but when the movement involves many hundred miles of carriage by ox-wagon the process is, of course, a long one, and requires time. We have only just heard by post (15th December) that the Volunteer and Burgher contingents of the Western provinces had moved. Later telegrams tell us that large numbers of these troops have arrived on the borders of Basutoland, and the proceedings of the next month will show whether the Colonial Ministry has undertaken a task within the power of the colony to carry out or not. I feel myself convinced

that, however great the sacrifices they may be required to make, the colonists will ultimately be the victors in this struggle—a struggle, let me once more repeat, between law and anarchy, between civilisation and barbarism.

But it is of course possible that this expectation may be disappointed, that the colonists may sustain some serious reverses, such as the European forces have received in most previous wars, and their strength may not be adequate to put down the rebellion unaided. It must be confessed that the colonists are very heavily handicapped. To confront a foe, which taxed the vigilance and generalship of Sir George Cathcart when leading a large body of several thousand British troops, is a severe task for volunteer levies. Since Sir George Cathcart's time the strength of the Basutos has enormously increased in numbers, in equipment, in horses, and in arms. The engagements in which Colonels Clarke and Carrington, Messrs. Barkly and Surmon, Brownlee and Strahan, and other colonial leaders have been so brilliantly successful, have shown that ten years of peace have not lessened the courage of the Basutos, nor deprived them of their skill in a natural strategy which enables them to surprise an unwary foe. The colonists have hitherto received little encouragement or sympathy from this country. The wildest exaggerations of Basuto success and the most unfounded calumnies against the colonial forces have been industriously circulated by the local opposition at the Cape, and have been too readily accepted by the public in England. Few public writers profess any belief in the power of the colony to uphold the law and restore order unaided by Imperial troops, and many have urged the active intervention of Her Majesty's Government to subvert the constitution of the Cape Colony, and to take the administration of native affairs under the direct control of Her Majesty's Government; and this proposal, be it remembered, is not for the purpose of upholding law and protecting life or property, but avowedly to screen rebels from the consequences of their rebellion.

Under such circumstances it would not be surprising if the colonists were to fail in the arduous duty of self-defence which they have so gallantly taken on themselves. I believe they will not fail; but whether they accomplish what they have undertaken or not, I think that no true-hearted Englishman, no lover of civilisation, no one who prefers law to anarchy, and peace and lawful industry to war and idle license, will fail to do homage to the courage and patriotism of the Cape Ministry, and those who support them. No English statesman could have shown more temper and prudence, more humanity, more single-hearted devotion to public duty, than Mr. Sprigg and his colleagues; and they will, I feel convinced, when their case is understood, be rewarded by the ultimate deliberate approval of all right-judging classes in the old country.

Quite apart from the question how the Basutos *have been* treated is the question how a people like the Basutos, just emerging from barbarism, *ought* to be treated by their powerful Christian neighbours.

What say the Basutos themselves? We have the answer of chiefs like Masupha and Lerothodi, and of the majority of the Basuto people who have followed them. It has been given in the most complete form and unquestionable terms by their deliberate action during the past year. They will accept the white man's arms of precision and his saddlery, his ploughs, and some other of his wares; but of his ways, political or social, they will have none. Basutoland must remain for the Basutos, governed by chiefs practically absolute and uncontrolled, except by a plebiscite of the tribe in which the chief is virtually supreme; for if any one presumes to act for himself, even by obeying the law of the English Government, or following the counsel of the French missionaries, let him be 'eaten up;' let his cattle be confiscated to the chief's use, his wives and little ones made bondwomen and serfs in the chief's kraal; and let the man and his grown-up sons who dare obey the law rather than the chief's will, be slain, unless they can save themselves by flight.

The European sympathisers with the rebels may not go so far as to approve this programme in all its details; but, if their advice were followed, Basutoland would remain exclusively appropriated to Basutos; protected from external enemies by the English and Colonial Government, but governed by chiefs who may accept as much or as little as they please of the advice of the English Government, even on such vital points as whether the whole population shall be fully armed and prepared for immediate war, or have arms as in Natal, Transvaal, and the Orange Free State, only by license or sufferance of the European Government.

But what is the answer of the English Government of the Cape Colony?

I have no doubt in my own mind what would be the desire of the present Cape Government. They would take adequate security to prevent any re-armament of the Basutos, such as has already led to such deplorable consequences. They would give adequate protection to life and property throughout the country by means of a militia and police force recruited from the local tribes. They would abrogate the power of the chiefs as conferred by hereditary right; they would give to every Basuto the same means of acquiring private property in land by individual title, as opposed to tribal communism, as is now enjoyed by Europeans throughout the country, and I feel no doubt that ultimately, when the adequate number of separate holders of property within the district, and their state of civilisation, justified its admission to the same privileges as a district of the old colony, the Cape Parliament would gladly extend to the inhabitants of Basutoland the same representative institutions which are enjoyed by the

inhabitants of other provinces in the colony. They would, in fact, deal with Basutoland much as the English Government dealt with Wales and the Highlands of Scotland when the present order of things took the place of the old tribal system of chiefs and their followers in the mountain regions of Great Britain.

I cannot imagine what more than this could be desired by the most ardent advocates for native rights. Space does not admit of my discussing alternatives which have been suggested, such as the creation of a native Alsatia, under the direct control of the Secretary of State in England, which shall exclusively belong to the natives, and shall be entirely independent of colonial interference. I can only state my conviction that the more such plans are examined, the more utterly impracticable they will appear, and that there are no probable—I had almost said no possible—arrangements under which such Alsacias, or native reserves as they are called, could be rendered in South Africa otherwise than a curse alike to the unfortunate natives compelled to inhabit them, and to the population under European law which may be in their neighbourhood.

Still more certain am I that, however well intended and honestly devised the arrangements might be, no such experiment could be permanent. The English Government and tax-payers would become responsible to all surrounding European communities for cattle thefts, and all other disorders and irregularities usually committed by natives. The reserve system would require money to start it, even if it could ultimately be made self-supporting, and the money required would be most certainly withheld by the Imperial Parliament after the first fervour of the founders of the experiment had evaporated.

But I would ask where is the proved necessity for any such segregation of the races? Have they not lived amicably and prosperously side by side in many districts in the old colony, under conditions which no reasonable philanthropist would wish to see altered by anything which the law can do?

In a paper which I sent to the Secretary of State some time ago, but which I do not think has been published, I pointed out the actual fusion which is taking place in the older districts of the colony between the races of European and African origin. In speaking of fusion of races, I would be understood as meaning fusion social and political, which would leave the two races distinct but living side by side in the same districts, with equal rights and equal chances of social and political progress, as Celts and Saxons live in Wales and Scotland, or Czechs and Germans in Bohemia.

Such political fusion is, as I have stated, no longer a matter of hope and speculation in the Western provinces of the old colony; it is an actual fact, and is not confined to those districts. It may be seen as an accomplished stage in social progress in most parts of the

colony, including some of the latest settled frontier districts. Farms may everywhere be found, sometimes in considerable numbers, belonging to native owners in permanent individual tenure, cultivated by them and their native labourers, and the number of such native holdings is constantly increasing.

Everywhere in the old districts of both provinces and in British Kaffraria, every franchise, political and municipal, is enjoyed without distinction of race or colour; and in some districts, and especially in Cape Town itself, the native vote is very influential, and quite capable, if united, of deciding an election.

In and out of the Colonial Parliament there is a considerable party of educated colonists, having a powerful section of the press at their disposal, whose object and basis of party union is to secure just treatment for the native races, and I can testify that they never found an unwilling audience in either House of the Cape Legislature.

These are the results of the present system of administration and legislation under the present free constitution of the Cape Government. I would ask what more would the most sanguine practical philanthropist propose or desire? I have seen a good deal of native and European races, side by side, in other parts of the world, and can honestly affirm that I have nowhere seen conditions so favourable to a steady progress of the native races, and to their ultimate rise in civilisation and prosperity, as in the old Cape Colony. Much, doubtless, remains to be done. In many points, such as the laws affecting the sale of liquors to natives, further improvement and legislation might easily be adopted from the laws of Natal and other quarters; but, taken as a whole, I believe that nowhere are the two races, the natives and the Europeans, to be seen together under conditions more favourable to the real and steady progress of the natives than in the Cape Colony.

What are the alternatives suggested—suggested, it must be remembered, before any real proof has been given of the failure of the present system? One alternative, which is frequently proposed both in this country and in Africa, is that the native races in South Africa 'should be managed as they are managed by the Government of India.'

To this I would, in the first place, observe that our management of India and its natives is not the result of a plan carefully devised by statesmen in the Cabinet. It has grown, as the English Constitution has grown, by a happy concurrence of circumstances favouring the development of certain national characteristics. The natives of India, be it remembered, are not, as a rule, unused to the domination of foreigners. With very few exceptions, every native race in India has had ages of experience of rule by foreign masters, and, provided the rule is not harsh, provided it leaves a good deal to native custom and usage, and protects life and property,

the rule of some foreign nation is not usually distasteful to the Indian villager and citizen. The practical good sense and reverence for law and right, the courage to confront the strong, and to protect the weak, which are the natural characteristics so common among men of our Northern European races, have done much to make our Indian services, civil, military, and political, what they now are, very well-devised members of the machinery of the best practical system of bureaucratic government now in existence.

But, above all, the agents have been well selected and well trained, and the greatest stimulants to the growth of a good system of administration in India have been the power and responsibility there necessarily entrusted to all administrators. These powers created a practical independence of distant control which India enjoyed for many years, under a powerful corporation, vested with sovereign powers over a region so far removed from England.

How many of these conditions are obtainable in South Africa? Whether they be many or few, any sound colonial system for managing colonial difficulties, including the great native question, must be allowed to *grow* in the same way as the British Constitution, and the system of British management in India, have grown. We have in the ruling race in Africa many of the same elements as in the race which now rules India. Let those elements grow and develope. It may be difficult at once to obtain in the colony the well-trained, well-selected, and well-paid services, the large armies and the ample financial resources which are at the disposal of the Government of India. But something of the same kind, or natural substitutes for them, will grow in their own way. They cannot be furnished by Acts of Parliament, nor by the most admirably devised constitutions which can be laid down in despatches.

After a long series of desolating Kaffir wars, the English Government resolved that the system of allowing colonial management of colonial affairs to grow and develope itself, instead of being ruled from England, should be practically tried. The plan has answered fairly in other far-separated colonies. It has been for eight years only in operation at the Cape. I believe it has answered still better there than it has in Canada or Australia, for reasons which space does not now admit of my stating. But, even if there are many disappointments, what are eight years for the growth of such an organism as a nation? Those who would withdraw from the Cape Colony the gift of responsible government ask us to act like impatient children, pulling up the seeds they planted yesterday, to see whether or not they are growing in the right direction.

This consideration, that time has not been allowed to the colonists to develope a constitution under which they will live, would, it seems to me, be an amply sufficient answer to the second alternative, which is the favourite suggestion of English politicians who criticise affairs at the Cape.

Under various forms, and to various degrees, the general proposition is that, inasmuch as the colony, when suddenly required to do for itself that which, within our memories, required the services of 13,000 British troops, and because the colony, so weighted, has not within six months accomplished a task such as used to take our generals and their armies years to effect, therefore the Secretary of State for the colonies should be charged to undertake the direct management of all the native tribes of South Africa, leaving the colonists to manage the rest of their affairs.

The condition of the Cape colonists is indeed, in any case, a hard one. If they succeed in subduing their rebellious native subjects, the Secretary of State is to intervene and take the management of such native subjects out of colonial hands, to prevent the rebels being overpunished. If, on the other hand, the colonists fail in accomplishing their hard task, assistance to restore peace by the aid of Imperial forces may be rendered only at the price of the colonists surrendering their constitutional liberties.

But if the state of affairs, so far, is bad at the Cape, what ground have we for hoping that they will be permanently improved by their management being transferred from an office in Cape Town to London? Can we believe that the number of persons who are deeply interested in the welfare of the natives, who know what they require, and how it may be bestowed on them, is greater in England than it is in South Africa? Can we persuade ourselves that we are better informed than they on the spot, or better disposed to do all that is possible for the benefit of races which furnish the only steady supply of labour of every kind which the colonist can hope for? Is it credible that the thousands of colonists who go out as Englishmen, well disposed to perform their Christian duty of doing as they would be done by, suddenly become both blind and wicked directly they have crossed the Line? On what other possible suppositions can we believe that any man, or body of men, residing in England, can do as well for the natives of Africa as the colonists who are there already? The difficulty of steering a ship by means of a speaking trumpet in the hands of the pilot on shore is proverbial. But surely the difficulty must be admitted to be insuperable when the pilot on shore is less interested and worse instructed than the captain and his crew.

Even if it were otherwise—if it were possible to hope that a Secretary of State, liable to quit office with every change of Ministry, much absorbed in home affairs and foreign affairs, duly controlled by Parliament, and influenced by voluntary philanthropic and industrial associations outside Parliament, who occasionally visit him by deputations—if we could suppose that a statesman so weighted could really manage the natives of Africa better than a Government of intelligent conscientious Englishmen on the spot, it needs but a moment's reflection to convince any unprejudiced person that the attempt must

from other causes surely fail. There is a period in the life of every country, as of every individual in it, when the exercise of direct parental authority is no longer necessary or possible; when the community, like every man of mature age, is, if not the best, practically the only possible judge, of what he shall do or attempt within the limits of law. There is a distance beyond which the wisest and best parent cannot usefully attempt to control the actions of a son of mature age and fully developed powers, bodily and mental—a distance at which it is still more impossible for any Government to interfere directly in the administration of a country containing a population of hundreds of thousands of such sons, whom, if they were living in England, no one would dream of controlling, as to their actions in matters personal and political, within the limits of the law.

When responsible government was given to the Cape Colony, the question was, ‘Has the colony arrived at that stage of material, social, and political development which renders the exertion of direct parental authority by the mother-country inexpedient or impossible?’ The English nation deliberately answered this question in the affirmative. It renounced the *direct parental*, while it retained its *sovereign* authority. The decision was accepted by the colony and has been since acted on. It appears to me—it will appear, I think, to any unprejudiced judge—that it is just as impossible for England now to retract this gift and to subordinate the colony to official management of its African native affairs from London, as it would be to expect any colonist of mature age who has been ten years his own master in the colony to return voluntarily to direct parental leading strings in England.

The die has been cast, the son has gone forth his own master, for good or for evil; he may fail of success, or he may perish; but return to the schoolroom and to a state of pupillage is not a possible remedy for ill-success in life. The parent may and ought to afford sympathy, and can aid in a variety of ways, but not by attempting to reassert such parental authority as the child has outgrown.

In the above remarks I confine myself as far as possible to facts which admit of no question. There are many other topics which have great importance on every bearing of this question; such, for instance, as the injurious effect of the possession of firearms on a vain semi-civilised or uncivilised race—the consequent warfare which has afflicted the country, as the revolutionary fever of eighty years ago affected Europe, or the insurrectionary fever of 1857 affected India. There is also a still larger question in the bearing of some form of union on the management of the races of South Africa.

But these are more or less connected with matters of opinion. I have desired to confine myself as strictly as possible to matters of fact; and want of space, moreover, forbids further discussion of such subjects at this moment.

H. B. E. FRERE.

THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.

No. XLVIII.—FEBRUARY 1881.

RITUALISM.

THE greatest novelist of our generation, on whom the grave has just closed, has described in a powerful story one of those ignoble persecutions which from time to time disgrace English life. It is not the persecution of the strong by the strong, or the intelligent by the intelligent; the result of a keenly contested fight between incompatible principles and convictions on each side, equally deep and serious. It is the rising up of all that is poorest and basest in human nature, its cowardice and selfishness, its ignorance, its cant, its coarse vulgarity, its vice, its hatred of good, against sincerity in religion and earnest effort to raise the standard of living. A new clergyman appears in an old-fashioned country town, where all is sleepy and easy-going, and which, beneath its sleepy case, is full of wretchedness and sin. He preaches as if he believes what he says, and he acts as if his words were true. He is a man of energy and purpose; and his preaching, and the interest which it excites, and his practical measures, begin to make a stir in the dull little place. Its privileged sloth and stupidity, its idle gossip and lazy spite take the alarm, and band together against the disturber. Its worldliness and its wickedness are frightened and provoked into fury, and take the attitude of indignant championship of honesty, morality, and pure religion.

The opening chapters of 'Janet's Repentance,' in George Eliot's *Scenes of Clerical Life*, describe the character of the opposition

raised, and then the measures taken to make the place too hot for the man who wishes to change the religious ways of Milby. As the obnoxious innovator touches consciences and attracts confidence, the town becomes divided into Tryanite and anti-Tryanite. The opponents of the movement are well-to-do and powerful persons in the place. There is the keen, self-confident, overbearing attorney, brutal and drunken at home, the unresisted bully and tyrant abroad, with all the threads of business in the country round him in his hands, 'who, as long as his Maker grants him power of voice and power of intellect, will take every legal means of resisting the introduction of demoralising, methodistical doctrine into this parish.' There is the rich miller, whose education and value for education are not in proportion to his balance at his bankers', and who will not stick at trouble to put down proceedings which are sure to ruin the morality of servant-maids. There is his better-read neighbour, who talks about Hobbes, and who holds seriously that 'this sectarianism within the Church ought to be put down;' that the unpopular religionists are 'not Churchmen at all,—are no better than Presbyterians.' And so the list goes on, including the sarcastic general practitioner and the sleek churchwarden, with much zeal but a rather loose reputation. The controversy is a wide one: but the minute point around which the struggle rages is, whether or not a new Sunday evening lecture shall be started in the place by the unpopular clergyman. And the story proceeds to relate the efforts made by these worthies to avert the threatening mischief; how a memorial is got up to the non-resident rector to disallow the proposed innovation; how a deputation waits on him, and brings back a favourable answer; how a popular demonstration, organised by the all-powerful attorney, in favour of 'Sound Church Principles and no Hypocrisy,' welcomes the delegates on their return; and how the leader of the agitation announces to his sympathising fellow-citizens the success of his mission. He assures them of the pleasure which it gives him to witness the strong proofs of their 'attachment to the principles of our excellent Church.'

*

The pulpit, from which their venerable pastor has fed them with sound doctrine for half a century, is not to be invaded by a fanatical, sectarian, double-faced, Jesuitical interloper. We are not to have our young people demoralised and corrupted by the temptations to vice, notoriously connected with Sunday evening lectures. We are not to have a preacher obtruding himself upon us, who denies good works, and sneaks into our homes perverting the faith of our wives and daughters.

Dishonesty and unfaithfulness to the Church, priestly meddling, and the mischief to morality and the peace of families caused by the new religious methods, and by the intrusion of ambitious and domineering clergymen; these are what are urged by the opponents of innovation at Milby.

George Eliot's story belongs to the times of the Evangelical movement. The doctrines against which the parishioners of Milby are called upon to rally to the Church are the 'methodistical' doctrines of Venn and Simeon. The object of obloquy and persecution is an Evangelical clergyman, fervent, self-denying, indefatigable, with narrow views of the world, and probably not always judicious, but pure and high in his standard of life, and with the root of the matter in him in his genuine sympathy for the sinful, the tempted, and the suffering. The story could hardly be written with any probability of an Evangelical movement or an Evangelical clergyman now. Evangelical religion has lived down this kind of opposition. But nevertheless it could be written, with great truth, as a type of things that have been going on during the last ten or fifteen years. The characters, so powerfully drawn in 'Janet's Repentance,' have not disappeared, nor the occasions which lead them to show themselves. The fierce blind antipathies, the implacable bitterness, the insolent and brutal bullying, the dense and blundering ignorance, the detestable hypocrisies, there described, still trouble actual English life. They have found and fastened on another quarry. They are still loud against dishonest and disloyal clergymen. They are still sensitive to pestilent heresies which threaten the soundness of the Church. They still appeal to the good old times before changes were heard of, and complain that they cannot recognise, under the newfangled fashions, the churches and services to which they were accustomed. They still raise the cry that clerical influences corrupt morality, and clerical claims endanger the peace of families. And as it was in the Evangelical days, good men are not always wise, and earnest men are sometimes extravagant. But another set of people have drawn on themselves the unpopularity which the Evangelicals first provoked. If the story were written of our present times, Mr. Tryan would be drawn as a Ritualist.

But if the story were written now, a fresh element would have to be added. Mr. Dempster, the shrewd attorney, would hardly have been equal to himself, if the law had not occurred to him as a means of annoyance. The disciples of Thomas Scott and Romaine were frowned upon by bishops, mocked at as 'saints' by the world, charged with Calvinism, Antinomianism, and Dissenting tendencies by controversialists, worried and insulted by lazy pluralists and parish despots; but no one had the thought of putting down their obnoxious proceedings by the help of the courts. The new feature in the opposition to a strong but unpopular religious movement, and one which has brought us to the brink of a grave constitutional question, is the active recourse to the tribunals—not to prohibit false teaching: resort to them has been given up, since they have clearly evinced their inclination to be neutral in questions of doctrine—but to arrest and suppress, by the strongest measures, a certain list of outward

practices in divine service, which are supposed to indicate the ideas and leanings of a party, and which no pains and no expense have been spared to get declared illegal, and, which is not the same thing in popular parlance, unlawful.

In much of all this there is nothing strange. Every strong religious movement, challenging what is accepted and customary, and calling on people to change their thoughts and their ways, must expect to provoke equally strong opposition; and when once opposition begins, it will be with each set of opponents according to their kind. 'Puseyism' and 'Tractarianism,' to recall nicknames which are now half forgotten, of course had to meet what had once been the lot of 'Methodism' and 'preaching the Gospel.' The teaching signified by those names was not only argued against and rebuked by the learned and the dignified; it was insulted, misrepresented, vilified, slandered by the ignorant, the vulgar, the malignant. Like all movements, it had its weak points, and its injudicious and extravagant exponents; of course it paid heavily for its follies and faults. Severe blows were dealt it: it was for many years under a ban, on the part of authority and in the eyes of the public. But the attempts to put a legal stigma on 'Tractarianism' were feeble, and failed. It was left to fight its battles as it could; to carry on controversy with divines in the schools; to live down popular stupidity and coarseness in the market-place or the vestry; and it has become quite a respectable thing now to be an 'old Tractarian.'

But the case has been different with 'Ritualism.' The great awakening in the Church, sometimes identified with what is called 'Tractarianism,' but which was certainly wider in all directions than the range of that movement, turned men's thoughts to the enlarging and deepening their religious ideas, and to the elevation of their standard of religious life. Newman's *Parochial Sermons* represent with singular and typical exactness the belief, the teaching, the aims of the High Church school, which was at the head—was, at least, most energetic and conspicuous—in the general quickening of the Church. They addressed the thoughtful, the refined, the educated, the scholarlike, and they did their work. But there was something more to be done, and something more naturally followed. The Church is not only for the refined but for the multitudes, and it does little if it does not enlist the interest and sympathy of the unlearned and the half-learned, the men with scanty leisure and much worldly business. The attempt to popularise followed the work of the theologian and the moralist. In such an attempt two things obviously occupied a foremost place: preaching and solemn worship. In the next chapter of the history of the Church movement, these were the marked and distinguishing features. The men who made the attempt boldly and systematically soon got a nickname; they were called 'Ritualists;' and if the wave of interest in the objects

and teaching of the Church has spread from earnest clergymen and from favoured rural parishes to the keen and busy classes of the towns, the result is very largely due to those who carried on in this new way the work of the old Oxford movement.

Of the use made by them of the instrument of preaching, I have not to speak. But they took in hand, also, to improve and raise the character of public worship. That there was much to improve, few reasonable people would now deny, though it is equally reasonable not to be surprised that the best people fifty years ago accommodated themselves without difficulty to what shocks us now. Men's eyes are opened as time goes on, on art, on politics; and why not, without any disrespect to our fathers, on what is seemly and fitting in worship? But surely it is not too much to say that on this subject most well-informed people were very ignorant; customs in most places were very slovenly. The first attempts at remedy, humble as they were, were involved in the general unpopularity of the so-called 'Tractarians.' They sought to restore the Eucharist to its due place in public worship, and to make it more frequent; they substituted the surplice for the preaching gown, and added the offertory and the prayer for the Church Militant to the ordinary Sunday service; and these changes, which now excite no remark, were sufficient to produce furious riots at Exeter, and later, with such additions as a chanted service and surpliced choir, at St. George's-in-the-East, which even statesmen deigned to excuse. But the 'Ritualists' attempted more. What they attempted was to find a reasonable, consistent, and appropriate rule and method for using the Prayer Book in public service. For the Prayer Book gives us its holy and beautiful words of devotion; it is sparing in its directions on the many questions which may arise in using them. To take one instance: except the Ornaments rubric, in which no vesture is named, and two rubrics in the Consecration Service of Bishops, there is not a word, I believe, from beginning to end to say that any particular dress is to be used in service; the word 'surplice,' if I mistake not, does not occur in the Prayer Book. The book may be used, but the manner of using it indefinitely varied, without any contravening of its scanty directions; this is not theory but obvious fact, to be verified by simply visiting half-a-dozen churches anywhere. Custom must always go for much in public usages, such as common worship; and to give people a custom of which they could render an intelligent and consistent account was the object of the reformers of English ritual.

It was certainly not easy to do this—to give people something more solid than the suggestion of each man's taste, or knowledge, or sense of reverence; and it is hardly the time to pronounce on their success. But they did what it was most natural to do. They turned to the only authoritative rule, the famous 'Ornaments rubric,' silent

itself, but directing them to the established order of a certain fixed date. Some of them, doubtless, did more. They advanced wide and untenable claims to all *præ*-Reformation usage not formally prohibited. Some of them showed a very marked inclination to find their rules in modern Roman usage. But their appeal, as a party, was to distinct Anglican authority, to which they believed that they were referred in the Prayer Book. They may have added points of their own; they may have claimed, where directions were obscure or imperfect, to judge what was most seemly and reverent, most accordant with the general usage of the Church. But their appeal has been throughout, and on principle, to the sources to which they were sent by the Ornaments rubric, the last and final order of the Church and Realm.

The attempt was surely a reasonable one, even if it turned out an impracticable one. Mere custom, and especially the custom come down from a time which had not cared much for public worship, was not so sacred a thing in such times as our own. And how was it met?

It was met of course with fierce opposition. Men like those who opposed the Evangelical Mr. Tryan, found in it a new and promising object on which to direct their hatred of what is energetic and troublesome in religion; and enough foolish and intemperate things were done by some Ritualists to provoke sober-minded people, to disgust sensible ones, and to frighten timid ones. But it is quite idle to deny that it called forth a response of enthusiasm and sympathy from numbers of those classes whom the Church had as yet hardly touched. They certainly welcomed the Ritualists' interpretation of the Prayer Book and its use. I do not go into the causes of this. I do not undertake to estimate its worth. But a man must be blind who does not see what is the real strength in the Ritualist congregations, and what is the effect of their services in rallying to the Church men, young and old, who certainly never came to church before.

One part of this, the opposition, was natural: the other, the popularity, was by most people, I suppose, unexpected. And if this had been all, Ritualism, like other English movements, would have had to fight its battles, and take its chance; it would suffer for its extravagances and mistakes, and have the benefit, in the long run, of what was reasonable and sound in its position; it would, of course, come into collision with strong convictions, which were irreconcilable with its principles, and have to bear the blame, justly or unjustly, of the strife and confusion that might ensue; but it would have had fair play. In time sober judgments could have been formed about its pretensions. The effects of novelty and changes of custom, whether irritating or attracting, would gradually wear off; and people on all sides would be able to make a calmer and clearer estimate of what was before them.

But a new turn was given to the whole matter when appeal was

made to the law. The law courts had been appealed to in the recent controversies on doctrine, with the result that, except in very extravagant cases, they practically declined to pronounce on the doctrinal questions submitted to them, and left matters as they were. But when questions of ritual came before them, involving a great number of separate points, some of them apparently of a very minute character, they followed a different course. They pronounced very peremptorily and decisively. They treated the Ritualists' contention as groundless, and their arguments as futile and hardly serious. They prohibited without hesitation, and they marked their disapproval of the claims of the Ritualists by giving, in most of the cases, costs against them.

When once the appeal to the law by the opponents of the Ritualists had been successful, other things followed. Inferior courts necessarily followed the ruling of superior ones. One superior court naturally had regard to the ruling and judgment of a former one. The matter was assumed to be removed from the sphere of argument; and when recourse to the law had proved so successful, it is not to be wondered at that it should become the convenient instrument of controversy. The courts had entered on the task of practically making the law for the Church on the customs of public worship, and they were making it as the party opposed to the Ritualists desired. The Ritualists found themselves in a position in which none of the previous religious movements in the Church had been placed. They found themselves, in matters purely of religious interest, with the law set in motion against them. They saw, too, that under the impulse given, the law might claim to meddle with other things besides Ritualism.

The early prosecutions of Ritualists had been the ventures of individuals. Their success led to an organisation on a large scale, to carry on the legal war. And to make matters worse, a step was taken, which confirmed and encouraged them in their policy. Nominally to expedite and cheapen ecclesiastical suits—a purpose to which the results have been in the oddest contrast—really, as everybody knew, to 'stamp out Ritualism,' the Public Worship Regulation Act was passed. The authorities of the Church called in the help of the State to scourge the heretics of the hour. An Act of the Imperial Parliament passed to put down certain dresses and lights and gestures of reverence, which those who objected to them sneered at as contemptible trifles.

Throughout the course of the controversy, two inconsistent lines of objection have been taken by the critics of Ritualism. Their doings have been alternately represented as mere 'man-millinery,' and 'tomfoolery' unworthy of a sensible man's interest; and then, as so formidable as to justify measures against them quite without precedent in our later religious history. First their practices were matters

of utter indifference; then they were things which threatened the faith and the Church. I do not see what answer can be made to the Ritualist dilemma. If the things for which we claim liberty are so unspeakably unimportant, why do you not leave us alone? if you are right in taking so much trouble to put them down, it must be because they are important, and it is natural that we should fight for them; but you have no business to abuse us for making a fuss about childish follies when you get Acts of Parliament to suppress them. Of course every one knows that a deep theological antagonism is at the bottom of the dispute. But the Ritualists have a right to say that here they are within the law, and challenge their opponents to attack them on this ground.

The truth is, that the attempt of the Ritualists to find some intelligent basis for the details of public worship ought to have been met in a more patient and far-sighted way by the authorities of the Church. Granting all that was provoking and self-willed in some of the Ritualists, they were not all of this temper; bishops, too, have to deal with other provoking men besides Ritualists. The Ritualists really had something to say for themselves, and they found it hard to get a fair hearing. The bishops, some of them at least, made two mistakes: they failed in the power of imagining a state of things in public worship, of a different type from what custom had made familiar; and they undervalued the men whom they looked upon as their opponents. No doubt to a person accustomed all his life to the old-fashioned English surplice, the proposal to put on a cope or chasuble must have seemed at first extravagantly ludicrous. He would first ridicule it as preposterous. He would then become indignant at it as a puerile attention to trifles. People forget the wise saying, that all ceremonies appear ridiculous to those who are out of sympathy with what they imply. Public sarcasm has not always spared lawn sleeves and judges' wigs; and democratic critics have been heard to speak disrespectfully of the Order of the Garter. If the question of the reasonableness of the Ritualist interpretation could be settled, the question of custom and familiarity would settle itself in due time, like many other changes from the ecclesiastical customs of our youth, and even manhood. But, for various reasons, the bishops as a body—judicious and cautious men—did not at first take in the strength of the Ritualist case, and thought to repress innovations by authority. They had to deal with men who, on their own subject, knew what they were talking about; and the unfortunate prejudice that the whole affair was a dispute about trifles prevented their superiors from feeling this. It seemed impossible *à priori* that the Ritualists could be right, and their reasons were discussed not on their merits, but on grounds of policy and the general aspect of things. The natural results followed: increasing want of sympathy on one side, increasing sense, on the other, of being treated unreason-

ably and unfairly, without real knowledge of their case or consideration for their objects: harsh acts and words on one side; alienation and resistance on the other; till it has come to this, that people accept with a grave face the idea of putting down gestures and preventing more or less of reverence by the powers of law; and we have had two or three clergymen in prison, and another deprived, for disobedience to the ruling of the courts on these points.

It is a very old maxim that if people try to settle differences by the wrong methods they only inflame them. Litigation is not the right way to settle differences which mean nothing if they do not arise out of deep religious convictions. At any risk, even the risk of cases of non-compliance with their bishop's directions on the part of Ritualists, unable to convince *him*, and whom he could not persuade, litigation ought from the first to have been steadily discouraged, and the more so when it sprang, as recent litigation has done, not out of legitimate complaints of disturbed parishes, but from party policy and the merely colourable interest of prosecutors like Dr. Julius at Clewer. All reasonable men owe a great debt of gratitude to the Bishop of Oxford for the stand which he made in the interests of the whole Church in a case which presented such a ludicrous counterfeit of the aggrieved parishioner; but the stand ought to have been made more widely and earlier. No one can wonder at the bishops' having been surprised and disturbed at the proposals of the Ritualists. We are all creatures of habit, and occasionally mistake habit for something settled and perpetual in the nature of things. But it is to be wished that they had earlier remembered how often it happens in life that what shocks us at first sight as unreasonable alters its aspect on closer acquaintance and on longer familiarity; and had considered that it might turn out that there was more truth in the Ritualist allegations, and more practical good in the Ritualist recommendations, than at first seemed likely. That this is so, certainly seems to be the opinion of an increasing number of sober clergymen who could not be called Ritualists; and if more of us had had the sagacity to recognise this sooner, some, probably, of our troubles and scandals might have been spared us. I suppose that most of us can trace in ourselves more than one change of opinion and feeling on the points raised by Ritualism. We have all had much to learn, and what we have learned has confessedly raised the standard of public worship in our churches. Such an experience ought to warn us against being precipitate, even when at the moment we are startled and do not approve. Undoubtedly bishops are bound to prevent hasty changes from being forced on unwilling congregations; but the history of the last forty years shows to what extent the feeling of congregations and parishes alters as to what is seemly and necessary for proper care and reverence in divine service.

It may be that the whole question is entering on a new stage. If so, it is to be hoped that the matters involved in it will be discussed

on their merits, and without the complications produced by charges of insubordination, lawlessness, and rebellion, which have confused and embittered it hitherto. It is really time to say that to talk of anarchy in the Church is a misleading and dangerous exaggeration. The clergy as a body, even those few who differ sharply and painfully with their bishops, are honestly loyal, and earnestly desirous both to receive guidance and to render obedience; and this is not anarchy. In the strong cases of difference, where clergymen have acted on their own responsibility and taken the consequences, real and important constitutional questions are raised, on which they may be right or wrong; but these questions could be fought out in no other way, in our present circumstances, than in the way of resistance; and in spite of the vehement and often inexcusable language used on all sides, there has been no intention, in the great majority of these cases, of impairing episcopal authority, or of setting at nought the law. It is indeed one of the wants of our time to strengthen episcopal government; but this must be done by reasonable methods; and the vow of canonical obedience must not be taken, any more than the woman's vow in marriage, to mean unlimited submission in judgment and conduct.

But if appeals to law go on, we must remember that law is for all of us. It will not do to be throwing about charges of lawlessness while we ourselves ignore the law. Even on the theory of the opponents of the Ritualists we none of us knew what the law was, till the Court of Appeal declared it. If that law is accepted, it must be accepted in earnest; it must be accepted by all, in high station or low; it must curtail the liberty which some of us prize of being content with elastic customs which are not law, but which it would be disagreeable to change. And more than this, this view introduces a principle of strict and rigorous exactness in carrying out rubrical law, which may create unexpected embarrassment, from the peremptoriness of some directions, and the looseness and imperfection of others. And the persons who will have to enforce this legal strictness will be, not aggrieved parishioners, but our ecclesiastical superiors.

R. W. CHURCH.

THE TRANSVAAL.

THE Transvaal is singular, even in the most unhistoric regions of South Africa, from having no authentic history beyond the memory of men now living; it has nevertheless, during such brief period, passed through more revolutions than many ancient states during their whole existence, involving four almost complete changes of ruling races, Bechuanas, Zulus, Dutch, and English.

Men now alive can remember when the greater part of the Transvaal was thickly peopled by Bechuanas, a nation far in advance of their Kaffir and Zulu brethren of the great Bantu family, as regards all the arts of life. Fifty years ago the Bechuanas had been so harassed by Zulu invasions, especially by the great inroad of Moselekatze, that those who escaped massacre had fled towards the Kalahari Desert to Secocoeni's country and to Basutoland. English sportsmen, in 1836, saw elephants, rhinoceroses, and giraffes in the fertile valleys among the recent ruins of populous Bechuana villages where now stand Pretoria and Potchefstroom. They visited the camp of Moselekatze, the Zulu chief, 'the Attila of South Africa' as he was called, the cause of the more recent devastation, just as he was encountering the 'Vortrekkers,' the leaders of the great Boer emigration, who, after many reverses and much severe fighting, finally drove him to the north-east, where he died, leaving his son to rule over his people, the Matabele (Zulus), who had finally settled in the land where they now dwell, 600 miles north of Zululand.

The tendency of the Dutch Boers in the Cape Colony to emigrate beyond the colonial boundary appears to date from the earliest years of Dutch settlement. There are on the statute book of the Dutch governors various regulations which aimed at repressing this tendency. Some of the colonists, after settling for years on what was then the frontier of the colony, were in the habit of seeking, in the then unexplored regions beyond the colonial boundary, a land of less administrative restraint on their wanderings. Efforts were made to restrain this tendency, by legal penalties; but nevertheless a steady emigration of the more enterprising inhabitants of the colony had been going on for generations when it received a sudden fresh impulse from the emancipation of the slaves in the old colony. Little discretion

or consideration for the feelings or interests of the Dutch masters was shown in giving effect to the English Emancipation Act. In a great majority of instances the slaves of the Dutch farmer at the Cape had been better treated than in most of our other colonies, and a strong sense of injustice and unnecessary harshness towards the masters was, in the case of the wealthier and more respectable families, frequently added to the inevitable pecuniary loss caused by restrictions on the supply of labour to which they had been accustomed. Hence, when the cry went forth among the Dutch farmers that 'they must seek a home beyond the British boundary where they would be free from the interference of the humanitarian English Government,' the crowd of 'Trekks,' or emigrants, was swelled by many families of comparative wealth and respectability, who left what had been their homes for many generations in the best parts of the old Cape Colony, hoping to find freedom from interference beyond the Orange River. They were by descent men of a proud and determined race—Dutchmen and French Huguenots, whose ancestors had left their homes in Europe rather than submit to religious tyranny. They had been within comparatively recent times subjected to English rule, and their own religious fanaticism often added to the inevitable irritation of their position, as an incentive to found a new and more free territory beyond the English boundary. Some made their way, in 1835–38, by a direct route to the Transvaal; but others travelled beyond the sources of the Orange River, and finally descended into Natal, which, after the cold and exposed uplands on the other side of the mountains, seemed to them a veritable land of promise.

Natal had then been almost emptied of its inhabitants by successive visitations from Zulu 'impis.' In many parts the scattered native inhabitants had been reduced to such straits that cannibalism was rife among them, and thrilling stories may yet be heard, from old people in Natal, as well as in Basutoland, of the cannibalism of which they had themselves been the threatened victims and, in some instances, the partakers. Here, as elsewhere in South Africa, the depopulation was quickly followed by an increase of beasts of the forest, and most of the old inhabitants of Natal can tell of herds of elephants they had themselves seen; one of the surest proofs of the general depopulation of the country.

Dingaan, the Zulu chief, appears at first to have been, like his predecessor Chaka, well inclined to the white men who visited him, and to have thought that he might turn their firearms to his own advantage. In reply to an application from Piet Retief and others of the Boer leaders for land to settle on, he set them a task to recover some cattle which had been carried off from his people by a neighbouring chief. This task was duly performed, and as a reward

he ceded to the Boers a large tract of territory, for the most part void of human beings, and now forming the best districts of the Colony of Natal. But the speed and accuracy with which they had performed a difficult service seem to have aroused Dingaan's jealous fears of what these white men might hereafter do, and the ink was literally barely dry on the document by which he ceded to them the territory they asked for, when he invited the Boer deputation to a parting feast, and had them all massacred on the spot, sending out 'impis' in various directions to surprise and destroy their families wherever they were found encamped. The memorable story of this massacre of Piet Retief and his gallant band of followers, and the subsequent massacres of Boer families on the 'Bloody Sunday,' in 1838, will ever be the starting-point of Boer history, and the foundation, in Boer estimation, of their claims to whatever land they have since conquered from the Zulus and other native tribes.

But the Boers in Natal found a more formidable obstacle than Dingaan in the constitutional claims of the English Government at the Cape. By that Government the Boers were looked on as runaway subjects, and as having broken the colonial laws by emigrating from the colony and setting up a rival dominion in Natal, where a few English settlers had previously obtained grants from the Zulu chiefs Chaka and his successor Dingaan. Hostilities between the Boers and the English Government ensued, which, as in most cases of the kind, may be narrated from two points of view, according as the narrator is a Dutchman or an Englishman. But the result was that the territory of Natal was taken over by the British Government, and finally erected into a separate colony, in 1844, whilst those Boers who were not content to remain under the new dominion trekked to fresh homes in the Transvaal and Orange Free State territory.

The pages of Livingstone's earlier travels show how the Boers, when they settled in the Transvaal, encroached on their weaker native neighbours.

All these things, be it remembered, are matters of living memory. Some of the men who are now leading the Boer malcontents can remember their original home in the Cape Colony. Many more have heard of those homes from their parents, and most can tell of their weary wanderings for thousands of miles, of their descent into the rich valleys of Natal, of the Zulu massacres of their friends and families, of the strict operation of English law, and of their own final settlement in lands of which the wild beasts of the field were then the actual possessors, and which, as they believe, they rendered their own by building civilised habitations, and substituting flocks and herds for the elephant and the antelope.

It is well to take note of these things in judging of the present feeling of the Boers towards us, as well as towards the natives; and to

remember that the Boers believe they held the Transvaal by the same right by which we hold Canada, India, and many other possessions—the right of conquest.

We must now glance at the different fortunes of the two Dutch Republics founded by the emigrant Boers beyond the Orange River.

The practical independence of the Boers of the Transvaal was from the first assured to them by what is called the Sand River Convention (in 1852), by which their independence was recognised on conditions mainly directed to prevent their enslaving the native tribes in their neighbourhood. But the Orange Free State was at first retained as British territory, and was after some years, in 1854, cast off by the British Government, greatly in opposition to the expressed wish of a large number of its inhabitants, and formed into a separate republic.

Compressed within Natal, Basutoland, and the old Cape Colony on the south, and by the Transvaal Republic on the east and north, the Orange Free State has been restrained within definite limits, and its present development has been thereby greatly promoted. The value of this compression was not at first recognised by the Orange Free State, and its people have not yet forgotten the grievance of the English Government accepting the submission of the Basutos, and declaring Basutoland British territory, just as its ruler was on the eve of surrendering to the Free State.

After this, in one direction only was expansion possible, towards the west, and there the discovery of diamond fields, in a territory to which the right of the Orange Free State was disputed, again brought them in collision with the English Government. The Diamond Fields were annexed to the British territory under circumstances which, however defensible, caused to the Government and people of the Orange Free State intense dissatisfaction, which was not entirely removed by the parliamentary grant of a large sum of money as compensation. There can be no doubt that the neighbourhood of the English colonies has greatly assisted in the development of the Orange Free State, but the steady progress of that republic is more especially due to the statesman who has for many years filled the office of President. Mr. Brand entered public life at Cape Town as son of one of the leading citizens, Sir Christofel Brand, who enjoyed the respect and esteem of all his fellow-colonists as Speaker of the Legislative Assembly. Mr. Brand had been called to the English bar, and had practised with great success in his native colony, when he was elected for the first time President of the Orange Free State. He has since been twice re-elected; and his wisdom and firmness, his statesmanlike foresight and sound patriotism, will never be forgotten as long as the name of the Orange Free State has a place in history.

Very different has been the fortune of the sister South African Republic in the Transvaal. It was some time before anything like a central government was established. The emigrant Boers, while they were still moving, had been in the habit of convening separate Volksraads, or assemblies of the people, as occasion required, at each large camp; and for some time after they settled down, though on great occasions the whole body of the Boers were summoned to meet, there were practically three republics, making more or less claim to separate and independent existence and power of legislation. Wakkerstrom, and subsequently Lydenberg, at first appeared likely to be seats of government for one republic; but Rustenberg, on the opposite western frontier, was a nearer and more convenient capital for those who settled in that part of the country. Potchefstroom, in a good commercial position, ultimately became the central capital, till the government was moved to Pretoria.

But the selection of a capital did little to remove the inherent difficulties of governing so vast and so sparsely inhabited a region as the Transvaal. The compression from neighbouring states, which acted so beneficially in the case of the Orange Free State, did not exist in the Transvaal. Around the whole circuit of frontier, with the exception of the Natal and Orange Free State boundaries in the south, were tribes who invited Boer expansion. The sons of the Vortrekkers, throughout a great part of the Transvaal, were under no obligation, like their brethren in the Orange Free State, to submit to the ruling of a central government; they could move further afield into the wilderness whenever the central government affronted them; and hence arose a process of disintegration and disinclination to obey any central authority, which has been the real proximate cause of most of the subsequent difficulties in the Transvaal. Volksraads were convened with due formality, and passed numerous laws; but, practically, it was found impossible to get the law obeyed, unless obedience happened to suit the views of individual Boers. I have been assured that it was no unusual sight for large bodies of Boers, armed and mounted, to threaten a visit to the legislature to compel it to rescind obnoxious laws; and even while the law remained on the statute book, obedience was often refused by armed bodies sufficiently strong to render it impossible for the executive to compel obedience: malcontents who did not wish to remain and resist had always the option of seeking, by a fresh 'trek,' countries where obedience to any law would be unnecessary.

The spirit thus engendered led, as far back as twelve years ago, to a great emigration across the Kalahari Desert into Damaraland. Some were discontented with their government; others were instigated simply by the desire to find a better land, or by love of enterprise. Moving in bodies of from sixty to a hundred wagons,

they speedily exhausted the scanty supplies of water on their march ; their route was often badly selected, and almost every company of emigrants suffered terrible hardship from fever and thirst, from loss of companions, cattle and wagons, before they reached the healthy regions on the west of the desert.

This disastrous emigration preceded the annexation of the Transvaal by the English. It was, to a great extent, caused by the dissatisfaction of the Boers with the then Republican Government of the Transvaal, and the early history of those who undertook and suffered in the emigration supplies a sufficient answer to much that is now alleged against the conduct of the English Government in 1877. It would be well if those who now criticise the Act of Annexation would make themselves better acquainted with the history of the Transvaal Boers during the eight or ten years which preceded it ; but space does not now admit of more than a brief allusion to some of the prominent facts.

After the first Boer settlements on the north and west of the Transvaal, a very few years sufficed to bring about a reaction on the part of the native tribes ; who, instead of giving way as they had at first done to the intrusion of white settlers, began to press back into their old stations, and to resume the practical sovereignty of districts from which they had been expelled by the Boers—or, earlier still, by Moselekatze's Zulus. Sometimes the Boers were altogether driven out from their first settlements ; sometimes they were allowed to remain on payment of tribute to some native chief ; but over a large extent of country from the Waterberg round to the Zulu border, the Boer population was steadily being driven back and subjected to the supremacy of native rulers.

It was on the Zulu border that danger of a serious native invasion in force was most threatening ; but on the opposite side, on the western frontier of the Transvaal, disputes with native tribes had already brought the Transvaal administration into controversy with the English in the tract now known as the ' Keate Award.'

Between the Potchefstroom District, the border of which was the original frontier of the Transvaal, and the British territory in Griqualand West, is a large and fertile district, occupying the whole space between the Vaal and Hart rivers. This territory had been waste and almost uninhabited previous to 1838, but since that time had been partially occupied by Koranna, Bechuana, and Griqua clans, interspersed with Boer settlers. As the number of inhabitants increased, dissensions arose between the native tribes and the Government of the Transvaal regarding the true Transvaal boundary, and the question was referred for arbitration to Mr. Keate, then Lieutenant-Governor of Natal. He passed an award which assigned the greater part of the disputed territory to the native tribes. Mr. Martinus

Pretorius, the son of the famous Vortrekker, was the President of the Transvaal Republic, and it was understood that personally he felt bound to comply with the award which had been passed by Lieutenant-Governor Keate, but permission to do so was refused by the Transvaal Volksraad, and this was said to have been the proximate cause of Mr. Pretorius' resignation of the office of President. The subsequent interregnum, and the weakness of the Transvaal Government, prevented the English Government from adopting the obvious course of insisting on the validity of the award, and requiring that it should be carried out. After a period of much confusion and prolonged intrigue, the interregnum terminated by Mr. Burgers accepting the office of President of the Transvaal, which he continued to hold until the annexation in 1877.

Mr. Burgers belonged to one of the oldest and most respected Dutch families in the Cape Colony. He had been educated for the ministry in the Dutch Reformed Church, and was a man of much natural talent and of considerable reading and accomplishment. But, in the course of his studies at a European university, he had imbibed a good many of the modern German rationalistic views, which were entirely at variance with the Calvinistic tenets of the Dutch Reformed Church. This had not at all lessened his influence with that small but active section of his Dutch countrymen who are locally known as 'Liberaals,' or free-thinkers, in politics and in religion, while his natural eloquence gave him great popularity among his countrymen, who are passionately fond of rhetorical oratory. When Mr. Pretorius resigned the Presidency, there was great difficulty in finding any suitable candidate who was likely to command the suffrages of any large section of the Transvaal republicans, and the eyes of the intelligent and progressive 'Liberaal' party were turned to the eloquent young divine, whose bold defence of his heterodox views had already made him the talk of every Presbytery in the old colony. Mr. Burgers accepted the invitation, gave up theology, and became President. He lost no time in devoting himself ardently to the cause of progress in various branches of the administration, but a lack of experience rendered some of his best-devised schemes of improvement abortive, and finally brought his administration, and the country over which he ruled, to ruin. He had magnificent designs for popular education, for reforming the finances and establishing a gold coinage, for judicial reform and the foundation of good courts of justice, for developing the resources of the Transvaal and improving its communications with the outer world, but his plans were, for the most part, above the comprehension of even the more intelligent Boers, and quite beyond the financial power of the Republic to execute. Mr. Burgers visited Europe; but little practical benefit

for the Transvaal followed. Even the railway from Delagoa Bay, which, if carried out, would have been of inestimable value to the Transvaal, got no further than the raising of a loan in Amsterdam, large enough seriously to embarrass the finances of the Transvaal, but quite insufficient to execute even a section of the railway.

These results were patent to all the world, but there were besides rumours of advances made by Mr. Burgers to obtain alliances with more than one European power. German politicians and mercantile men thought seriously of obtaining a footing in the Transvaal, and there establishing a more effectual counterpoise to English commercial and political supremacy in South Africa. These plans were, however, not encouraged by the German Government, and Mr. Burgers returned to the Transvaal strengthened with little more than sympathy, and a few men of education and ability, chiefly Germans and Hollanders, whom he persuaded to accompany him to the land of promise.

But, though these foreign auxiliaries would materially have improved Mr. Burgers' power of administration in the Transvaal, they by no means advanced his popularity. They were often supercilious and unpopular with the old-fashioned Boers; more than this, most of the new-comers were 'Liberaals,' and were regarded with jealousy by the orthodox members of the Dutch Reformed Church, and still more so by the Dopper sect, which formed a large portion of the most persevering and industrious of the Boer agricultural community.

Among the most prominent of Mr. Burgers' difficulties was the necessity for enforcing the authority of the South African republic over the Basuto chief Secocoeni. This chief had rallied around him, in the strong country near the Gold Fields, the remnants of the Bechuana tribes who had been driven by Zulus from the open country of the Transvaal. Owing partly to the natural difficulties of attacking his position, and partly to the want of perseverance and defection of the Boers, Mr. Burgers' expedition to bring Secocoeni to obedience was, to a great extent, an expensive failure, and proved the immediate cause of the ruin of his administration.

This brings us to the period when Sir Theophilus Shepstone, in 1877, visited the Transvaal as Special Commissioner from the English Government. It is not necessary to recapitulate the instructions he carried with him, nor the history of his visit, as they are to be found in Blue Books.

In judging of the annexation of the Transvaal I would wish it to be borne in mind that it was an act which in no way originated with me, over which I had no control, and with which I was only subsequently incidentally connected. The annexation took place on the 11th of April; several days before my arrival at the Cape on the 31st

of March could be known to Sir Theophilus Shepstone, as the telegraph line did not then exist, and letters took over three weeks from Cape Town to Pretoria. I say this from no wish to lessen my own responsibility for anything connected with the Transvaal, but simply as a reason why my opinions on the subject may be taken as those of an impartial observer.

It was a great question then, as now, whether the annexation was justifiable. Let us examine this question as it affected, first the interest, wishes, and obligations of the Boers. Let us consider the Boers, in the most favourable light, as an independent people, who had achieved and wished to retain their national independence.

There can be no doubt that there was, at the time Sir Theophilus Shepstone visited the Transvaal, practically, anarchy and paralysis of all governing power in the administration. Mr. Burgers had no authority sufficient to enforce the laws, to realise the legal taxes, or to protect life or property. Nothing could exceed the desperate condition of the finances. There was absolutely no money in the treasury for any purposes of government, to pay salaries or even postal contracts. The paper currency of the Republic was so depreciated as to be rarely current, and barter was the general form of commerce where English money was not procurable. The Volksraad turned a deaf ear to Mr. Burgers' passionate appeals that they would save the State by simply paying the taxes they had themselves imposed, and obeying the laws they had themselves passed. The appeal was all in vain. When Mr. Pretorius resigned, no Boer could be brought forward to accept the Presidentship. The enterprising young Cape colonist who had attempted the task was compelled to confess his failure, and to give up the attempt; and when Mr. Burgers threw down the reins there was no one present who offered to pick them up save Sir Theophilus Shepstone, the English Commissioner. These facts have never been denied, and they cannot now be gainsaid. All that the Boers and their friends can even now say is, that if they had been left to themselves they would have 'pulled through,' and could have organised their State as well as the Orange Free State; but no one believed that this was possible in 1877, and no reasonable man who knows the facts really believes so now. Let those who doubt the accuracy of this picture consult the file of the *Volkstem*, the dutch journal of Pretoria, for February and March 1877, and they will there find in the reports of the proceedings in the Volksraad, and especially in Mr. Burgers' speeches, abundant evidence of the fatal paralysis of governing power, and the wilful abstention of the Boers from the only measures which could make self-government any longer possible.

The circumstances of the Orange Free State were, as has been already explained, quite different from those of the Transvaal.

None of the advantages which Mr. Brand found ready to his hand, and which made his arduous task a possible one in the Orange Free State, were to be found in the Transvaal. As regarded native enemies, especially, hedged in by the British and Transvaal territory, the Orange Free State had no 'native question.' But in the Transvaal the gradually widening and weakening circle of Boer 'trekking' had reached its limit, and had for some years encountered an unyielding circle of fierce and organised savage nations, which the isolated efforts of Boer 'commandos' were quite unable to drive back. To the north, to the east, and to the south, the Boers had distinctly failed, and were giving ground before the native tribes. Intelligent and patriotic Boers saw that they had no longer power to drive back the native races. It was one thing to direct the concentrated energies of the whole of the Vortrekkers' hardy emigrants, trained in habits of perpetual warfare, and it was quite another thing to attempt, by the authority of the government at Pretoria, to summon burghers from their settled homes 400 miles off, to fight Secocoeni with the assistance of a few mercenary foreign auxiliaries, whilst the Zulus, the Basutos, and the Matabele were looking on, prepared to join in the battle against the white men whenever a favourable opportunity might offer.

Sir Theophilus Shepstone had special and definite certain knowledge of the intentions of the most formidable race, the Zulus, which left no doubt as to the designs of their ruler on the Transvaal. He had again and again heard from Cetywayo himself, and from his most trusted messengers, earnest appeals that the British Government would not oppose his 'washing his spears' in the blood of his neighbours; that we would allow him to drive the Boers out of the disputed territory which Cetywayo had himself assigned to them; and that he was quite able and eager to sweep them all away for three hundred miles up to Pretoria, which he claimed as his by right of Chaka's and Moselekatze's conquests.

Whatever we may persuade ourselves as to his feeling towards Natal, there can be no doubt of his desire and ability to have exterminated the Boers, could he but have assured our neutrality. Knowing this, as certainly as man can know anything regarding the intentions of another, Sir Theophilus Shepstone was bound to state such an important fact to the leading men in the Transvaal. It was subsequently made a grievance that he had so informed them. Yet had he not stated what he so certainly knew, no words would have been strong enough to condemn such cruel reticence.

But, whatever the danger, the Boers, it may be said, did not ask our protection, and we ought to have waited till they did so.

What the Boers individually wished for was individual independence of law and government generally, not of this or that foreign government, but to obey no one by force of law; to be far from the power of compulsion; to see, as they put it, 'no other man's smoke;' to be free and unfettered in the wilds. This was the object of their aspirations. For national life and national independence they had a strong sentiment, but, for national liberty, they were not willing to make any sacrifice of their individual license, or power to refuse obedience to law. The limits within which such freedom was possible had been reached before Mr. Burgers undertook to attempt the task of governing. It is only the general conviction amongst Boers of these truths that can explain their passive acquiescence in the annexation.

But, it has been said, the measure was accepted by the Boers under protest; and the protest, recorded by Mr. Burgers at the time, has been since appealed to as affording colour to the assertion that it was an act of force on the part of the British Government. This theory, however, will not stand the test of examination by the light of unquestionable facts. For many weeks previously Mr. Burgers had held a session of the Volksraad; he had exhausted all his eloquence in earnest appeals to them to save their country, not by any acts of heroic self-devotion, but by simple obedience to the law and payment of their legal taxes; but his eloquence produced no result on the legislature. The republic, in fact, died of atrophy, and its death was certainly in no way accelerated by any action of Sir Theophilus Shepstone, whatever opinion may be held individually as to the time and method of annexation.

What then, it may be asked, was the meaning of Mr. Burgers' formal protest? I am afraid it must be admitted that the protest was nothing more than a dramatic finale to the attempt to govern, prompted by a natural desire to reconcile acquiescence in the measure adopted with the theoretical duty of obedience to the constitution. But, whatever the motive of the protest, it must have been clearly apparent at the time that a verbal protest, however strongly worded, was not the way to stop the annexation. Had the great majority of the Boers really desired to oppose it, nothing would have been easier than to have refused obedience to the proclamation; to have hauled down the British flag which Sir Theophilus Shepstone had hoisted, and to have presented him with his passports, and escorted him to the frontier. There were plenty of men among the Boers, and advising them, who were well aware that all this might have been done in a manner which could not possibly have given the English Government any just umbrage. Had they been willing to make the slightest sacrifice in order to secure their own independence, nothing further was necessary than to elect in Mr. Burgers' place a President who

would undertake the government, and, by paying their taxes, to give him the means of governing. But no such man was to be found at the time, and the Boers as a body acquiesced in the annexation as an inevitable necessity.

Again, whatever objection may be stated to the annexation on other grounds, the position of the natives, both in the Transvaal itself and its borders, has certainly been greatly improved, and yet further progressive improvement has been secured by coming under the British

But the question remains, Have not we, the people of England, any right to complain of the additional burdens imposed upon ourselves?

I think not. It was obviously incompatible with the safety of the English colonies, to allow a state of anarchy and lawlessness to exist in so near a neighbour. We know now what were the aspirations of the Zulus and other native tribes regarding the Transvaal, and what they could, and said they would, do if the English Government in Natal would but stand aside and leave them undisturbed to settle with the Boers. Any one who reads what the Zulus did without firearms when the Boers were united, and what the Zulus have since shown they could do, organised and armed as they were under Cetuyayo, may judge what would have been the results to Natal and to European rule generally in South Africa had the Zulus been assured that we should remain quiescent while they attacked the Boers, as they were only too eager to do.

But there was another danger which was very present to the mind of all who had any hand in the measure, though comparatively little has been said of it in the official justification of the act. There were, as Mr. Burgers and most of his colleagues well knew, other European Powers besides England who might be induced, if England would not, to undertake to aid the Transvaal in maintaining its existence. Mr. Burgers had sought such alliances without much success during his visit to Europe, but there was no reason to suppose that such objections would be maintained if the great Governments of Europe were once assured that England declined the responsibility, and would view with indifference the establishment of any other great Power as protecting Transvaal independence.

The conversion of the Transvaal into an allied colony had been, and is still, a favourite project among many in the German mercantile world, and in Holland among those who look forward to the ultimate absorption of Holland into the Germanic Empire. It is useless to speculate what might have been the result had the German Government been induced to give encouragement to such projects; but assured, as the English Government must have been, that such a result was possible, it would have been suicidal policy, as regards

our colonies in South Africa, to have hesitated to give to the Transvaal, in some form or other, the assistance which she required to maintain her existence when the Transvaal government was in a state of such complete paralysis.

It has been contended that the possession of the Transvaal has inconveniently increased our national responsibilities. The assertion, I think, admits of more than doubt. But even if any increase of responsibility could be proved, the time for limiting our colonial responsibilities by declining to admit new colonies to be founded is long since past. The objection might have been a practical one three centuries ago, before we possessed any colonies; but it is out of date after a colonial history which from the foundation of American and West Indian colonies down to that of Fiji, proves, if it proves anything, that the increase of colonial responsibilities is not incompatible with growth of national power to hold, to rule, and to defend them.

Hence, from whatever point of view the matter is looked at, whether from that of the interest of the Boer population and their wishes at the time, or from the interest of the native populations, or from that of our own position in Africa, I do not see what other course could have been adopted consistent with due regard for our own safety and the real interests of our neighbours, other than annexation of the Transvaal to the British dominions. Whether it might not have been effected in some better way, or at some other period, may, like other speculative problems, remain a question for discussion, but it is for those who can suggest such an alternative to state it. The present question is, Was it possible to leave the Transvaal to drift further into anarchy, or fall a prey to its native neighbours? If not, in what other way could the absolutely necessary result of establishing some settled European government have been brought about?

The members of the Volksraad had hardly dispersed to their homes after the proclamation of the annexation when it was discovered that the new *régime* would interfere with the position of many men, chiefly educated foreigners and strangers, who had previously profited by the state of anarchy, and they had little difficulty in working on the general feeling of the Boers, and persuading them that the annexation was uncalled for, and likely to be injurious to their interests.

A mass meeting, with elaborate discussions in questions of politics, has a peculiar charm for the Boers, and when they were got together it was not difficult to persuade them that they had been betrayed by their rulers, and might be oppressed by the English officials, to whom they bore but little love.

Messrs. Kruger, Jorissen, and Joubert were commissioned by the

meeting to proceed to Europe with a protest against the annexation. The deputation was variously represented as a formal protest, and as a make-believe exhibition, intended to satisfy the more advanced malcontents that everything had been done to relieve their consciences for acquiescing in annexation. The deputation reached Europe, but extracted little beyond ordinary formal courtesy, and an assurance of the impossibility of revoking the measure. It failed to arouse the sympathies of any Continental Power, and returned without having achieved any result satisfactory to the protesting parties. A second mass meeting and a second deputation followed, in which Messrs. Kruger and Joubert took part, but no different result followed, and the members returning from England reached South Africa just as the Zulu war had broken out and our arms had met with a disastrous check at Isandhlwana.

If, looking at the whole administrative results of the eighteen months then elapsed since the annexation, it be said that there was want of vigour in carrying out necessary reforms and in enforcing the levy of taxes under the old laws, it must be remembered that Lord Carnarvon, who understood as well as an English statesman could, the wants of the Transvaal, had left office, and his loss was a very serious one to the Transvaal. But above all Sir Theophilus Shepstone had met with most unexpected opposition in arranging the disputes between the Transvaal Government and the Zulus.

It is impossible here to go fully into the history of the quarrel between the Zulus and the Transvaal republican Government, which was one of the proximate causes of the Zulu war. Cetywayo, during the lifetime of his father Panda, had purchased from the Boers the persons of two of his fugitive brethren, rival candidates for the succession, who had taken refuge in the Transvaal. A large tract of land was promised to the Boers by Cetywayo as the price of their compliance with his desire. The Boers were permitted to occupy the territory, where they built houses, planted trees, and divided the country into farms. But the transaction was not approved of by Panda, the ruling chief, nor by the Great Council of Zulu chiefs and counsellors, and on this ground the confirmation of the grant was subsequently evaded by Cetywayo when he became sovereign, and had consolidated his own power and imagined himself more than a match for the Boers.

As Secretary for Native Affairs in Natal, Sir Theophilus Shepstone had felt more sympathy for the Zulu claims to resume, than he did for the Boer claims to retain, possession of the disputed territory; but when he came to look at the question from the other side, and with the light thrown on it by the documentary and other evidence produced by the Transvaal authorities, he was con-

vinced of the justice of the Transvaal claim. He had always had great personal influence with the Zulus and their ruler. As soon as possible after the annexation he went to that part of the frontier which was the scene of the dispute, in the belief that he might be enabled to come to an arrangement with the Zulus which would satisfy the reasonable claims of both parties. At Sir Theophilus Shepstone's request Cetywayo sent a large deputation of his principal chiefs and counsellors to meet him on the border, and great was the astonishment of the English Administrator and of most of those with him when, instead of finding that his arrival at the scene of conference was regarded in a friendly light, he was met with every demonstration of anger, not unmixed with contempt. Zulu chiefs who had been his obsequious friends while he was Secretary for Native Affairs in Natal, spoke to him with undisguised want of respect, and, instead of a disposition to accommodate and compromise, he met nothing but a defiant assertion of Zulu right to the whole country.

The fact was that the Zulu ruler had always been used to regard the Boer Government of the Transvaal and the English Government of Natal as rival, if not hostile, powers, and he was unable to understand or brook the appearance of his old friend and adviser as the ruler of the Transvaal and advocate for Transvaal claims.

At first it appeared as if war were imminent, and more than one experienced observer of Zulu affairs predicted that the Zulu 'impis' would at once take forcible possession of the whole of the disputed territory including portions of two districts which unquestionably belonged of right to the Transvaal. Immediate hostilities were, however, averted by the intervention of the Natal Government. The Lieutenant-Governor, Sir Henry Bulwer, sent to Cetywayo offering his good offices, and proposing to appoint Commissioners with a view to arbitration. The proposal was acceded to. The arbitrators were all Natal officials selected by the Lieutenant-Governor, and proceeded to make inquiry and report on the questions at issue. The Boers produced their evidence, including many documents proving the cession by Cetywayo on behalf of the Zulus, then under his father's rule, of the greater part of the territory claimed by the Boers; but they were unable to prove any formal ratification of this cession by Panda, or by the great council of Zulu chiefs. The Zulus declined to produce any evidence, or to discuss the question of cession. They denied that any cession had been made, and advanced claims which would have embraced a region far beyond the territory in dispute. They, however, limited their present claim to the disputed area, and simply announced that that area their king intended to have.

The Commissioners made a report which, after some references

back for further explanations of its purport, was accepted by the Lieutenant-Governor of Natal, and handed on to me, as High Commissioner, for approval. The Arbitration Commissioners in effect threw out the whole of the evidence, oral as well as documentary, produced for the Transvaal. They did not notice the fact that the grant to the Boers by Cetywayo as the price to be paid for the delivery to him of his two brothers had never been, till quite recently, denied by the Zulus; that it had been a prominent subject in Panda's complaints to the Natal officials of the overbearing conduct of his son and heir, that 'Cetywayo had made the grant without his authority, and might get out of the difficulties in which it had involved him as best he could, for that he—Panda—would not ratify the cession.' The award entirely ignored the private rights which had grown up during long undisturbed possession, it did not notice the obligation which lay on Cetywayo not to retract as supreme chief the grant he had made as virtual regent, and it pronounced, in no qualified terms, for the cession of the whole area in dispute to the Zulus.

After a careful review of the whole case, I was of opinion that, having selected the members of the Commission, the English Government was bound by their decision, which gave the sovereignty of the territory in dispute not to the British Government in the Transvaal but to the Zulu king. It was, however, clear that the private rights which had grown up in good faith while the territory was in the actual possession of the Transvaal Government had not been at all investigated, and I limited the award to the sovereignty of the territory in dispute, reserving the private rights of those who had settled on it during the Transvaal administration. What follows belongs rather to the history of the Zulu War. We have here only to note its bearing on the state of feeling in the Transvaal. It must not be forgotten that the Zulu War was in its immediate origin essentially a Transvaal quarrel. Hitherto it has been generally looked on entirely from a Natal point of view, and our relations with the Zulus were no doubt of even more direct importance to the existence of Natal than to the Transvaal. But the first question at issue was the territory in dispute between Boers and Zulus; and, though Natal might be saved from invasion and destruction by the surrender of the disputed territory, the Boers of all classes and in all parts of the Transvaal were extremely indignant at the result of the arbitration, and few recognised any mitigation of their grievance contained in the reservation of private rights which had accrued under the Transvaal occupation.

During the latter part of the time occupied by the proceedings of the Commission, and the subsequent deliberations of the English officials, Colonel (now Sir Evelyn) Wood had arrived with the

column which served under him in the Kaffir War against Kreli. He had marched through Kaffraria, and was then stationed within the undoubted Transvaal territory not far from the disputed border. The Zulus had sent two expeditions into the lands of Luneburg, a thriving Transvaal settlement of more than twenty German families, slaughtering the natives who did not save themselves by flight, driving off their cattle and children, and threatening to attack the village in which the settlers had entrenched themselves. The arrival of a detachment from Colonel Wood's column saved Luneburg from the execution of these threats. But Colonel Wood rendered an even more essential service by securing the confidence and co-operation of some of the best of the Boer frontier farmers. The name of Piet Uys will ever be associated with the exploits of his gallant chief. Piet Uys was the son of one of the bravest and most respected of the Vortrekkers, who had lost his life with many of his family and friends in the early Zulu war with Dingaan. His son Piet, attended by several stalwart sons and relations, were most efficient auxiliaries to us. Piet himself died a hero's death with many British officers and men at Hlobane, two days before Wood's great victory at Kambula. Such examples of their patriotism and heroic self-devotion as Wood's despatches record should not be forgotten at a time when there is much temptation to judge harshly of all the Transvaal Boers.

I had been informed in 1878 that Her Majesty's Government desired I should, as High Commissioner, visit Natal and the Transvaal. I had pointed out to the Secretary of State that it was impossible the High Commissioner should usefully exercise any superintendence over affairs in that quarter, unless the correspondence between the Lieutenant-Governor of Natal and the Administrator of the Transvaal with the Secretary of State were communicated to the High Commissioner, so as to make him acquainted with at least as much as the Secretary of State could be told of the facts which had occurred in Natal and the Transvaal, and the views which were entertained by the officers administering the government of those colonies. My suggestion had been acceded to, and it is only from that period that I had any direct or effectual connection with the conduct of affairs in Natal or the Transvaal.

One of the first convictions which a perusal of the correspondence conveyed to me was, that hostilities could not long be averted either with the Zulus or the Boers. It was a question with which of the two hostilities were likely first to break out; and it was possible that success against the first to break the peace might prevent any breach of the peace by the other power. This view, however, was not concurred in by the Natal officials. They had a strong conviction that the Zulus would never resort to hostilities

against Natal. They held that the only ground of Zulu hostility was our connection, unfortunate as it appeared to Natal, with the government of the Transvaal; and regarding the Transvaal they knew little, and did not concern themselves much.

Sir Theophilus Shepstone was then about to leave the Transvaal for England, where his presence was required to afford the information needful to enable Her Majesty's Government to draw up a constitution for the Transvaal. He was succeeded by Colonel (now Sir Owen) Lanyon, who had won the confidence of Her Majesty's Government by the energy and ability with which he had administered, under great difficulties, the affairs of the colony of Griqualand West. The Boers had advertised a mass meeting early in 1879 to receive the reports of their delegates, Messrs. Kruger and Joubert, regarding their second mission to England. They had invited Colonel Lanyon and myself as High Commissioner to be present at the meeting, and, on the incongruity of any such proceeding being pointed out to them, they desired that we would visit their camp before it separated, with a view to hear what the committee had to say, and to satisfy ourselves as to the unanimity of the great majority of the Boer population in protesting against the Act of Annexation. I had promised that I would comply with their wishes in this respect, but the check to the British arms at Isandhlwana, and the subsequent suspension of active operations and the perilous state of affairs in Natal and Zululand before the reinforcements sent from England could arrive, detained me longer than I had expected, and it was late in March before I was able to leave Natal for the Transvaal.

On my road to the Natal border, through the scenes of Zulu massacres forty years previous, I had ample opportunity of seeing how well-founded were the apprehensions which all the old inhabitants of the country entertained with regard to a Zulu invasion. It was quite obvious that nothing could resist or prevent such an invasion, except the fear of the invading force having its retreat cut off, as it returned incumbered with its spoil. The positions occupied by the three columns, which Lord Chelmsford had organised in Zululand, provided at the moment for such defence; and it was clear to any one going through the country, that but for the presence of those columns in Zululand, a Zulu 'impi' when once across the border might have swept up to the skirts of the Drakensberg without any possibility of effectual resistance outside the few fortified 'laagers.' The reinforcements from England had begun to arrive, and Colonel Wood's victory at Kambula, of which I heard at Newcastle as I passed near his camp at the end of March, was sufficient assurance that the worst part of the Zulu crisis in Natal was past; but it was still unsafe to withdraw any troops from the Zulu frontier, and con-

sequently, though the tone of the malcontent Boers in their camp had been threatening, I determined to proceed thither without escort, trusting to the good faith of their leaders, and their power as well as will, to observe the usages of civilised people.

During the six days' march between the frontier and the Boer camp, I had every day, and almost all day long, ample evidence that whatever kept the Boers together in their camp, agreement as to the wisdom of reversing the Act of Annexation formed no part of the motives of many who were present. Often on my road I was met by men, with few exceptions Boers, desiring to know the purport of the message I was empowered to convey to the Boer camp, and most anxious to ascertain whether a reversal of the Act of Annexation formed any part of my instructions. There could be no mistaking either the object or the sincerity which dictated these interrogatories. In very rare cases was there any evidence of sympathy with the avowed objects of the malcontent Boer leaders. Perhaps the most frequent opinion expressed was an assurance that my visitor did not in the least wish that the annexation should now be annulled. Many said they would rather have remained independent and self-governed, but most confessed that the change was for the better, and ought not now to be undone. In several cases very passionate appeals were made by wives and families to send back their husbands and sons who were, they said, detained in the Boer camp against their will. Several of my informants added that they had come to the Transvaal before the annexation, under the conviction that annexation was inevitable; others had come since the annexation, and were still more urgent in deprecating any surrender of the country by Her Majesty's Government to its former misgovernment.

At most of our halting-places after leaving Pietermaritzburg, we met kind advisers who volunteered suggestions that the visit to the camp would be attended with considerable danger, and that I had much better take one of the other roads into Pretoria. Probably the knowledge that such advice had been given me reached the Boer camp; for early on the morning of my visit I received a letter from the committee, apparently written in ignorance of my approach, and remonstrating with me in no very courteous terms on my having deviated, as they supposed, from my formally expressed intention of meeting them. My appearance was, however, a sufficient answer to their want of confidence, and a few miles before reaching the camp I was met by the committee and a considerable deputation of the leaders.

The limits of a single article do not admit of any detailed description of a very interesting and instructive visit to the Boer camp, which was followed by several interviews with the committee, and with individual leaders of the remonstrant Boers; nor of all

we saw or heard during some anxious days' at Pretoria, whilst the violent party in the Boer camp every night threatened an attack 'to turn out the British Government' and the handful of 200 soldiers who held the barracks, and to shoot or expel those who favoured the English dominion, which would have included the greater part of the population of the town. I can only briefly summarise the results.'

As regards the number of the Boers assembled, they claimed to have had more than 4,000 men in camp, all armed, and mounted, ready for active service. But 'a comparison of several careful enumerations by those with me, when the Boers were all assembled, led me to believe that there could not be more than 1,600, or at most 2,000, when we visited the camp. This reduction in the estimate did not make the meeting less formidable to the peace of the Transvaal, but it deducted much from their claim to represent the general desire of the whole population.

As regards the disposition and temper of the meeting, I had, from our observations on our way up, concluded that but a very small proportion of the rural population, and a still smaller proportion of the people of the townships, really concurred with the more violent leaders in desiring to resist or annul the annexation. Many were, we were well assured, present only through intimidation,—others, while they had felt the annexation a grievance, accepted it as an inevitable though disagreeable alternative of the previous anarchy,—leaving only a small, though violent and influential, irreconcilable minority, who would, if they could, have reverted to the republic.

This conclusion was warmly contested by the Boer leaders, but their arguments did not at all convince me after what I had myself seen and heard. It seemed, as far as I could judge, that a great majority of the men I conversed with, even in the Boer camp, would be content to remain under the English Government, provided they were well and wisely governed, and allowed a reasonable share in the future government of the Transvaal. This belief was confirmed by the fact that they were as well aware as we, our means of defence did not admit of successful resistance to a determined attack on Pretoria by one half the men who, at the lowest estimate, were then present, armed and ready for action, in the Boer camp. It was the darkest time of the Zulu war, and most of the Boers were loud in expressing their conviction that, in the Zulus, we had met more than our match. There was not a man who could then be spared to reinforce the Pretoria garrison from Lord Chelmsford's force, the nearest post of which was 200 miles distant, and the Boers believed, even more than their actual power warranted, in their own ability 'to put the whole apparatus of the English Government, and the regular soldiers present to defend it, across the border.'

The avowed object of the leaders in inviting us to visit their camp had been fulfilled. They had exhibited their numbers and had personally expressed to me the determination which kept them together. They had heard from me the most emphatic public assurances of my belief that the Act of Annexation could not and ought not to be reversed. Unless they intended to resist by force, there was no one of the declared objects of their meeting to keep them together.

But the leaders did not find it easy to break up the camp, and pressed for a promise from me that I would support the prayer of a memorial which they drew up as a help to them in dispersing their followers.

This I steadily and distinctly refused to do, and finally the committee said they would be content if I would convey to Her Majesty's Government an accurate report of their wishes as stated by the committee, and of the amount of support given to the memorial by the numbers present in camp.

This being a reasonable request, a verbatim report of the proceedings, taken from a shorthand writer's notes of our conferences, was forwarded home by me, after the report had been revised and accepted as correct by the Boer committee. The committee then gave the word '*huis-to*' (homewards), and before the next morning broke, the late occupants of the camp were streaming in wagons and on horseback along the roads leading in every direction from their late camp.

The full reports of all the meetings between the High Commissioner and the Boers will be found in the Blue Books on South African affairs, C. 2367 and C. 2374, of July 1879.

The Boers having dispersed, and every day bringing accounts of the arrival of fresh reinforcements at Natal, Colonel Lanyon (the Administrator) had arranged to accompany the High Commissioner, *viâ* Potchefstroom and the Keate Award, to the Diamond Fields; but at Potchefstroom we received despatches which rendered it desirable that Colonel Lanyon should return to the Natal frontier to give what assistance he could to collect a body of mounted Boers for Colonel Wood's column, and to prepare for operations against Secocoeni. Before leaving, however, we had arranged the measures which we agreed to recommend to Her Majesty's Government for the future government of the Transvaal. These embraced—

1. The creation of an Executive Council, in which some of the Boers should have a part as salaried members.

2. The creation of a temporary Legislature, capable of passing laws immediately necessary to strengthen the administration, and to prepare the way for a representative Volksraad or House of Assembly.

3. More efficient organisation and better payment to the High Court of Justice.

4. Some improvement in the position of the worst-paid officials.

5. A careful scientific examination of the line of the Delagoa Bay Railway.

6. Administrative reforms which were much needed, and included the provision of an efficient police force.

7. The finances were to be made the special charge of a financial commissioner, with a view to equalise revenue and expenditure.

8. As regarded representative institutions for the Transvaal, a great mass of materials had been collected, including opinions from the ministry at the Cape, from the Chief Justice of the Cape, and more especially from Mr. Brand, the popular President of the Orange Free State, who most generously gave all the aid, which his experience enabled him to afford, regarding the changes which he thought might suit the wants of the Transvaal. These materials were forwarded to Her Majesty's Government, and it was my intention, as soon as the views of the Home Government had been expressed, to have convened a conference at which the Transvaal remonstrant party would have been adequately represented, with a view to draw up such a constitution as might satisfy the reasonable desires of the Transvaal people for representative institutions. Mr. Pretorius had intimated his willingness to consider with his colleagues on the commission any proposal that he should assist as a member of the Executive. Hopes were entertained that Mr. Kruger might be willing to take a similar part in the measures which must precede the enactment of a representative constitution. But a few days after the news of the final dispersion of the Boers' camp had been confirmed, a telegram arrived from England, bringing intelligence of the Despatch of Censure on myself of the 19th of March. Two months later I was superseded as High Commissioner by Sir Garnet Wolseley, and from that time I ceased to have any share in the government of the Transvaal.

What has since been done there I can only, like the rest of the world, gather from despatches published in Blue Books.

When a conference to consider the subject of confederation was proposed in the Cape Parliament in its last session, Messrs. Kruger and Jorissen visited the Cape Colony and made a tour through the country districts, detailing the grievances of the Boers in the Transvaal and urging their brethren in the Cape colony to abstain from any movement with a view to confederation till independence had been given back to the Transvaal. Their eloquence made a sufficient impression on the constituencies to ensure opposition to the Government proposals. In this campaign the Boer delegates received

very effectual support from the opposition to ministers in the Cape Legislature and from the small body of Dutch republicans. Free use was made of the sympathetic utterances of prominent politicians in England, and letters from them to members of the Boer committee and of the local colonial opposition were quoted as proving that they would favourably consider the wish of the remonstrants to have the annexation annulled and the South African republic restored.

Since that time there has been a visible and gradual increase of expressed dissatisfaction with the existing government in the Transvaal, recently culminating in acts of violence and rebellion.

But enough has been ascertained to show pretty clearly the real causes of the recent outbreak. There has been nothing to aggravate any real grounds of discontent which existed when I met the Boers in April 1879. In many respects the action of the Transvaal administration has been such as to deserve and obtain popular support, and many advantages have already been secured to the inhabitants of the Transvaal by the English. Among them protection from the encroachment of native tribes, one of the first benefits to be gained by coming under the British flag, has, there can be no doubt, been established.

Financial reform, another great necessity, has been effected. Mr. Sergeaunt's report upon the finances (which he was expressly sent out to draw up) showed clearly the miserable state of disorder and bankruptcy into which they had fallen during the republic. To meet the more pressing needs of the administration, the Imperial Treasury arranged for a loan of 100,000*l.* The annual revenue has been increased from 70,000*l.* to 160,000*l.*, notwithstanding the abolition of obnoxious taxes; the increase being mainly due to better administration under Mr. Steele, the financial commissioner, and more honest collection.

Again, some progress, though not so much as could be desired, has been made in administrative reform; and all salaries are punctually paid.

Lastly, any ground for reasonable discontent on the non-use of the Dutch language in all matters of public business in time past, has now been remedied.

What, then, has instigated the Boers to choose the present moment for a rising, when they have been fairly well governed and effectually protected for three and a half years, have had some grievances redressed, and have ground to hope that every reasonable and possible reform would be carried out?

There can be little doubt, I think, that the present outbreak is due to external advice prompted by the embarrassments of the English

¹ See South African Blue Book, C. 2367, p. 87.

Government in the United Kingdom. When I met the Boer Committee, in April 1879, I saw reason to address them regarding some of their advisers—adventurers in the Transvaal of various races—broken men of the classes who in every country form the active agents of rebellion and revolution.

Since then, the same adventurous agitators have been actively at work, stimulating to resistance the Transvaal Boers and their brethren in other parts of South Africa, and urging them to reject all offers of self-government under the British flag, assuring them that they had only to persevere, to obtain unconditional rescission of the annexation. It is much to be feared that unguarded expressions of English politicians have strengthened this agitation. The removal of many troops, especially cavalry, and a knowledge of embarrassments to the English Government nearer home, have certainly been represented as affording an opening that might not easily recur for gaining all demands by force.

Besides British sympathisers and advisers, the Boers have active auxiliaries in Continental Europe. There is naturally a strong fellow-feeling with them among many classes in Holland. In Germany they will have the sympathy of many mercantile men who, on commercial grounds, advocate the establishment of Teutonic colonies as a counterpoise to the preponderating influence of English interests in colonial commerce; and they will have the active support of the ultra-Republican and Socialist parties in all parts of the world, whose main object is the overthrow of all settled and established governments.

The more important question, however, now is, what is to be done for the future?

Let not the English nation suppose that by throwing off all responsibility for the fortunes of the Transvaal we shall either insure the good government of the Transvaal or make our responsibilities in the other colonies of South Africa less. With a Transvaal Republic, which had achieved its independence by open revolt, and had possibly established itself under the protection of some foreign power, and with an ill-affected Orange Free State on one side, with a vast native population north and south, and in its midst, if Natal is to remain an English colony, it could only be secured by a considerable and costly garrison of English troops. We should not, by abandoning the Transvaal, secure peace or the possibility of civilisation to a single one of the native tribes round either Natal or the Transvaal, nor to the old Cape Colony. What has already occurred in the Transvaal has reopened the divisions which were fast healing up, and threatens to involve the Cape Colony. I have unshaken confidence in the moderation, patriotism, and loyalty of the great majority of the Cape colonists, and of those who are governing

them as their responsible ministers; but it is not difficult to plunge a youthful constitution into troubles which would be too much for the strength even of the oldest and most consolidated dominion. No one can contemplate, without a shudder, the idea of civil war between the two principal races which form the European population, and which have, by a combination of diverse great qualities, raised the Colony to its present condition of strength and prosperity. It would be impossible to forecast the future of such communities, but if the English Government were to repudiate its responsibilities in South Africa, I see no better prospect for some generations than the formation of a knot of small antagonistic republics, more or less civilised, but for the most part closely approaching the type of the Republics which have succeeded Spanish dominion in South America.

The first thought of the English Government should be to enforce submission to the law in the province which has rebelled against it, to re-establish a government able to protect person and property, and to defend the order which is indispensable to the existence of a civilised State; and by so doing to redeem the first and most important of the promises made to the people of the Transvaal on its annexation.

This having been done, no time should be lost in amending the constitution of the Transvaal, and making it more conformable to the wants and wishes of the population. This would not be difficult to arrange. I have already referred to the scheme drawn up for the consideration of Her Majesty's Government, and embracing the suggestions of some of the leading statesmen and jurists of the Cape Colony, and also of the able president of the Orange Free State. I should look with great confidence to the successful working of any Transvaal constitution which had the approval of Mr. Sprigg and his colleagues, and of Mr. Brand.

On another occasion I hope to indicate in what directions the most important modifications should, in my own opinion, be made, to secure unity of policy in all such important matters as the native question throughout all the English colonies in South Africa, and how, by co-operating with the Portuguese Government, we may set definite bounds to any extension of English responsibilities to the north of the Orange River and Limpopo basins; and so fix geographical limits within which the Anglo-Dutch subjects of the British Crown, and the people of the Orange Free State, shall have scope to grow as self-defending and self-governing dominions.

All I would now say is, let us beware of sending out cut and dried constitutions from England to a people like that of the Transvaal.

Of no people is it more true that their institutions must grow with them, or be adapted to all their peculiarities. The only way in which a good working constitution can be framed for a country in the position of the Transvaal is to give large powers to an experienced administrator on the spot, to draw up such a constitution as will be approved by the best men among the Boers themselves, as well as by the intelligent and experienced statesmen who rule the destinies of similar and kindred communities in the Orange Free State and the Cape Colony.

H. B. E. FRERE.

EXPLOSIONS IN COLLIERIES AND THEIR CURE.

I HAVE read Mr. Plimsoll's article in the December number of the *Nineteenth Century*, on 'Explosions in Collieries and their Cure;' and, agreeing with him that their cure is within the possibilities of science, beg to add my appeal on behalf of the miner to scientific men. For mining is now no longer a matter of rule of thumb, and we cannot hope for any real improvement except from persons who are thoroughly well acquainted with those natural laws upon which all science is based. But before they are in a position to grapple with the question, it seems to me essential that the way should be cleared for them by some one practically acquainted with mining, lest their energies be wasted over impracticable schemes, or in the solution of problems not directly bearing upon the point at issue. I propose, therefore, first, to point out one or two errors into which, it appears to me, Mr. Plimsoll, in common with more than one person of the highest scientific attainments, but, as I may conclude, practically unacquainted with mining, has fallen; and, secondly, to lay before your readers the real problem which I believe must be solved before we can hope to place any definite limit to these disastrous accidents.

Perhaps I should premise, in order to elucidate further a subject so technical as mining, that coal is found in beds varying in thickness from a few inches up to several feet, and extending with great regularity over large areas. These beds are seldom found lying either quite horizontally, or quite vertically, but are found inclined at all angles between these two extremes. There is also a great variety in the quality of the seams of coal, in the quantities of gas that exude from them, and in the character of the rocks between which they lie. We should, therefore, be naturally led to anticipate, and rightly so, that there are many systems of working coal so as to suit these varying conditions of its occurrence.

It would be impossible, within the limits of this paper, to describe even the more important of these methods, but I will try, in a few words, to make one of them—viz. the 'Board and Pillar' system of the North of England—sufficiently intelligible to your readers for my

purpose. I choose this method of working the coal for explanation in preference to others, because in connection with it goaf-drainage was, I believe, first mooted. This system of coal working will be readily understood from a consideration of it, as illustrated by the name 'échiquier' which it bears in France and Belgium. The black and white squares represent the pillars of coal left during the first working to support the roof of the mine. The lines separating these squares are the drifts or excavations made in the coal during the first working, or 'in working the whole,' as it is called. Afterwards the black and white squares, *i.e.* the pillars which have been left to support the strata above, are removed; and this, the second working, is called 'working the broken,' or 'working out the pillars.' The empty area left by the extraction of the coal, which, however, is soon filled up by falls of stone from the strata overlying the bed, is called the 'goaf.' This term 'goaf,' plural 'goaves,' is applied to the area from which the coal has been extracted, whatever be the system of working employed. I shall have more to say about the character of a goaf presently.

A seam, when first cut, gives off inflammable gases in larger or smaller quantities, according to the character of the coal, which gases, as Mr. Plimsoll has pointed out, being lighter than air, tend to collect in the higher parts of the workings. When mixed with air, in the proportion of one volume of gas to from five to fourteen volumes of air, they become explosive; and one of the principal objects of ventilation is to dilute these gases with sufficient air, so as to render them harmless, and then to carry them off out of the mine. By gas I shall here mean these inflammable gases, and by fire-damp an explosive mixture of these gases and air.

I shall pass quickly over the first four of Mr. Plimsoll's suggestions. Three of them—*viz.* mordants, collodion balloons, and absorption—would no doubt render valuable aid to the miner if practicable; but whether they are so or not I must leave to chemists to decide. One, the absorption of the gas, has already been attempted, but hitherto without success.¹ The fourth suggestion, the explosion of the gas in regulated quantities after careful examination of its first beginning to accumulate, was the system in vogue before the invention of the safety-lamp. Simonin mentions it in his book, *La Vie souterraine*, page 179, where also may be seen an engraving of the miner in the dress specially adapted to his dangerous work. I cannot do better than quote his description:—

En France, à Rive-de-Gier, on se rappelle encore le temps où un homme, courageux entre tous, venait tous les soirs enflammer le gaz dans la mine, en provoquer l'explosion, pour que les chantiers fussent de nouveau accessibles le lendemain.

¹ I see, in connection with the Penygraig accident, which happened so recently as December 10, that the Rev. T. Jones, of Rhyminney, is confident that he has now discovered the solution of his problem.

Roulé dans une couverture de laine ou de cuir, la figure protégée par un masque, la tête couverte d'un capuchon analogue à la cagoule des moines, il rampait sur le sol pour se tenir autant que possible dans la couche d'air respirable, car le grisou, plus léger que l'air, monte toujours au sommet des galeries. Il tenait d'une main un long bâton, au bout duquel était une chandelle allumée; et il allait seul, perdu dans ce dédale empoisonné, provoquant les explosions par l'approche de sa lampe et décomposant ainsi le gaz pernicieux. On l'appelait le *pénitent*, à cause de la ressemblance de son costume avec celui des ordres religieux; et ce mot semblait en même temps dicté par une dérision amère, car souvent le pénitent, victime sacrifiée d'avance, ne revenait pas, emporté par l'explosion. Sur d'autres mines on nommait ce brave houilleur le *canonnier*. Quand le grisou le tuait sur place, on disait que le canonnier était mort à son poste, au champ d'honneur, et c'était là toute son oraison funèbre. Le même ouvrier portait dans les mines anglaises le nom expressif de *fireman*, ou l'homme du feu.

I need hardly add, that though this system, under very careful management, might do some good service, it has long since been abandoned.

The method of ventilation proposed by Mr. Plimsoll is good; for not only is the gas lighter than air, as he has pointed out, but the air of the mine, being heated by contact with the warm surface of the stony strata, is lighter than the cool air coming down from the surface, and for the same reason it becomes lighter and lighter the further it travels through the passages of the mine. Its natural tendency is, therefore, to rise, like the gas, as it proceeds on its course towards the upcast shaft; and accordingly the current of air, as well as the gas, is most easily kept in circulation when this natural tendency is not obstructed. The downcast, or shaft for entry of air, should therefore be placed near the lowest point of the area of the coal working; the upcast, or shaft for exit of air, near the highest (the area being in almost all cases on an incline). This, a fact well known to mining engineers, is called ascensional ventilation, and is always carried out in the working where practicable; but sometimes it is impossible to carry it out effectually, for many conflicting interests may interfere with the choice of a situation for the shafts of a mine.

I now come to Mr. Plimsoll's principal suggestion—viz. that the gas should be drained off by means of a pipe placed in a hole or 'sump' made for it in the roof of the upper exhausted spaces in a pit, i.e. in the highest point of the goaf, and carried from this sump to the upcast shaft. This idea was brought forward, whether for the first time or not I cannot say, by Messrs. Faraday and Lyell at the Haswell Colliery explosion in 1844. A description of their apparatus was published by them in the *Philosophical Magazine* (third series, vol. xxvi. p. 16). A committee of mining engineers was appointed by the coal-trade of the north of England to examine and report upon this scheme. After a most careful consideration of the matter, they pronounced it not only infeasible, but of very doubtful benefit,

even could it be carried out. Their report² is too long for quotation in full, but a summary of the parts bearing upon this question will show the impracticability of the scheme.

Goaves are not limited in their dimensions, but ultimately, by the continued progress of the pillar excavations, come to be coextensive with the tract of coal-field which is being worked. It thus happens that there will be a greater or less magnitude of goaf, corresponding with the quantity of coal extracted, and that, at last, the mine will consist exclusively of goaf in any seam the coal of which has been entirely removed. It must further be remarked that there is not any certainty of an open communication between one part of a goaf and another part of the same goaf: the contrary is indeed the rule, as may be easily understood from the following considerations.

The immediate effect of the removal of a pillar of coal is to produce a fall from the bed of stone resting upon the coal; and the cavity made by this fall of stone is necessarily of a conical form. As the coal continues to be removed, the sides of the cavity lose their support, the cone is extended; and this process goes on until the superimposed strata, no longer sustained by the converging sides of the cone, subside, and rest upon the broken fragments of the fallen stones, which occupy a much larger space than did the same rocks when in a solid state. The summit of the cone does not then continue to extend upwards, but, as the excavation progresses, the strata rest upon the mass of stones forming the goaf, and the upper portion of the goaf becomes parallel with the lines of stratification. This is proved by the state of the upper beds of coal a few fathoms above the lower bed, which has already been extracted. The settlements and fissures there show that in some parts the fallen mass must be crushed extremely close, and that, in others, cavities may exist; the effect produced being, in fact, that of rendering the interior either, practically speaking, solid, or of dividing it into compartments which are isolated one from another. It must too be noticed that a passage will not remain open between the bounding edges of the goaf and the remaining coal yet unworked. Accordingly, the cavities in a goaf being isolated and detached, a pipe placed at its upper edge could not be depended upon as draining it throughout its entire space, and it would therefore be necessary to have a separate pipe at each avenue leading into each goaf. Further, at Haswell Colliery, to carry but *one* cast-iron pipe of the dimensions proposed by Messrs. Faraday and Lyell (twelve inches diameter and half an inch thick in the shell) from each of the fourteen goaves to the upcast shaft would require rather more than twelve miles of pipes, and would cost about 21,000*l*. As regards the current expense of maintenance, it is impossible to form any accurate estimate; but it would be extremely difficult to keep the goaf ends of the pipes in working condition, and a

² Published by I. H. Veitch, the *Chronicle* office, Durham, 1845.

fracture there, which is very likely to occur, would destroy the entire value of the apparatus. Moreover, the constant attention which would be required to keep in order the goaf terminations of the several ranges of pipes must without doubt, in so dangerous a situation, be attended with risk of frequent loss of life from falls of the broken strata.

I will now quote the last few lines of that portion of the report which refers to my subject:—

Your Committee have shown that the actual state of goaves is incompatible with that required for the efficient working of the apparatus suggested by Messrs. Faraday and Lyell; and, having also duly considered and explained the extreme difficulty, expense, and almost, in their opinion, impracticability, of carrying into execution the plan recommended by those gentlemen, together with the extreme uncertainty of its success, they regret exceedingly that they cannot recommend it for adoption.

The proposed scheme of gas drainage, introduced to your readers by Mr. Plimsoll, is, as I have already said, identical with the above. It has been before the public for thirty-six years, but no one, as far as I am aware, has attempted to put it into practice.

Several other plans have been proposed at different times with the same object in view, *i.e.* the draining off of the gas. Many of them are quite impracticable; but two, I think, are deserving of the consideration of mining engineers, *viz.* :—

Where an inferior seam of coal exists, of sufficient thickness, a few fathoms above the one which is being worked, drifts might be driven in it and boreholes put down from these drifts into the goaves and other places where gas was known to be, or thought likely to accumulate; and these drifts being put in communication with the upcast shaft, a current of air would sweep through the goaves and up through the boreholes into them, carrying with it the gas. These drifts would have to be driven a considerable distance ahead of the workings in the lower seam, so as not only to offer a vent for the accumulations of gas in the goaves, but to tap the gas also in the solid coal. In this way these excavations would also become exploring drifts, and would prove the existence of faults and other geological features of the area, thus enabling the engineer to lay out his workings in the lower and more valuable seam to the best advantage.

Another idea, which was carried out with considerable success at Springwell Colliery, in Durham, is to drive drifts in the solid coal a few yards to the 'rise' of each goaf and parallel to it (meaning by the rise any spot higher up the slope formed by the inclination of the bed). These drifts may be connected with the goaf, where deemed expedient, by means of other short drifts, and, the first being put into communication with the upcast shaft, a current of air is carried through the goaf into them, and the gas along with it.

There are, indeed, difficulties in the way of carrying out both these schemes, which will be patent to members of my profession;

but, nevertheless, either of them is possible in some cases, and would answer the purpose of draining a goaf, where desired, and at little expense.

But in these attempts to drain the goaves of the gas collected in them, are we doing all that is needed? Every miner will answer, 'No!' Dangerous though these receptacles of noxious matter may be, we have them under control to a very great extent. We know where each is situated, we are aware that they are charged with gas, and we take precautions accordingly.

Accumulations also of gas may be formed in at least two other ways. Suppose, first, that the ventilating current of air is not strong enough to dilute and carry away the gas which exudes from the pores of the coal forming the front and sides of a drift when newly excavated. This gas will soon form an explosive mixture with the air, and lie in some corner of the drift ready to take advantage of a defect in a safety-lamp or of any carelessness on the part of master or workman.

Again, outbursts of gas, or 'blowers,' as I would prefer to call them, whether they issue from the stone roof and floor or from the coal itself, but originating of course primarily in the coal, must be taken into account. These are very dangerous, as their occurrence is sudden and generally unexpected. Mr. Plimsoll appears to find a difficulty in accounting for their existence at all, principally, perhaps, because he does not realise at how very high a pressure the gas is in the interior of our coal seams. And though there may not be large cavities in the surrounding rocks, nor in the seams themselves, there are fissures large enough, when filled with gas at such pressures as we find from experiment to exist, to form more violent blowers than any I have myself encountered. And when it is remembered that a safety-lamp cannot be depended upon in a very rapid current of fire-damp, the great danger arising from these blowers will be readily understood.

That there are other parts of a mine in which an explosion is more likely to occur than in the goaves is no ideal conclusion. The Committee, whose opinion I have already referred to, report that, during the fourteen years which immediately preceded the Haswell accident, 'there have occurred eleven great explosions in the Northumberland and Durham collieries; and that these have happened, with perhaps one exception—though that one is of a doubtful character—where the respective mines were being worked in the *whole*; that is, in those parts where pillar-working had not yet been commenced. It is, therefore, clear that, in at least ten cases out of eleven, during the period in question, the goaves have had no connection with the origin of these accidents.' We see therefore that, even were it possible to drain the goaves of gas quite effectually, we

should still be liable to explosions, and that we must seek in another direction for anything like a radical cure for these disasters.

Under such circumstances, it is with very great diffidence that I venture to make any suggestion of my own; but an examination of the story of the different explosions, as told in the 'Mines' Inspectors' Reports,' shows that in the vast majority of cases they were either caused by actual negligence, or that their origin has never been discovered. We may, I think, draw the inference that these last disasters also were, in many cases, due to carelessness; and—when it is remembered that, unlike all other trades, the lives of the miners are often in the hands of the youngest boy or most ignorant workman amongst them—it is extraordinary that accidents do not even oftener occur. For we must remember that, numerous and distressing as such accidents are, the life of the collier is, after all, safer than that of most persons employed in other of the more dangerous trades. The merchant seaman, the railway servant, or even the sailor in our Royal Navy runs greater risks.³

I do not indeed, for my own part, anticipate that the better education of our miners, desirable as it is on other accounts, will have any very great effect in reducing the number of explosions; we may be assured there must always be some careless and ignorant amongst the large body of men required for the working of a mine. I would rather that scientific men should turn their attention to some cure not depending for its success upon the carefulness of the workmen as a body, and depending as little as possible even upon the carefulness of their employers, for the most careful and experienced must sometimes fail. But we know that fire-damp, until raised to a certain temperature, is not only inexplusive, but may be breathed for a time without ill-effects. Cannot our men of science give us light without heat? The first step in this direction has already been attained by the invention of luminous paint; another step, and the miner may be independent of lamp or candle, and an explosion cannot take place. If this be impossible, a new lamp, the heat from which cannot be communicated to the fire-damp through the neglect of its owner, would meet the needs of the case. Our present lamps, from the point of view of safety alone, for the light is but small, are almost all that can be desired in the hands of a careful person who knows how to use them; but we want a lamp equally safe in the hands of a careless or ignorant person. The electric light, so recently perfected

* During 1876, 11·428 merchant seamen lost their lives by drowning alone, 3·2 sailors in the Royal Navy lost their lives by all classes of accidents, and only 1·815 miners by all classes of accidents per 1,000 employed. During 1874 the proportion for railway servants was 3·703 per 1,000. See *Proceedings of North of England Institute of Mining and Mechanical Engineers*, vol. xxviii. p. 200. 1876 was a favourable year for miners; the number killed per 1,000 during the seven years ending 1879 is rather below 2½; but even this compares favourably with the deaths in the other trades.

by Mr. Swan for household use, may assist us in the solution of this problem. A main feature of his lamp, and one specially noticeable in considering its adaptability to the illumination of mines, is that the light is secluded from contact with the outer atmosphere, is in fact in a vacuum, and if the vacuum be destroyed the light will go out almost immediately. The miner's lamp at present used depends for its safety upon a wire gauze which surrounds the flame; the air necessary for the combustion of the lamp passes freely through the gauze to the flame, and along with it the fire-damp, should any be present; but the flame cannot pass out through the gauze. Accordingly, though the fire-damp often explodes inside the lamp, where the quantity being small no harm is done, it cannot explode outside the lamp, where the quantity of course may be sufficient to cause a serious accident. Mr. Swan's light, being in a vacuum, can never come in contact with the fire-damp at all. A violent current of air which, as I have already said, will blow the flame of an ordinary safety-lamp through the gauze and thus cause an explosion should fire-damp be present, would have no effect upon a vacuum electric lamp. A defect in a safety-lamp may be easily overlooked, but a defect in Mr. Swan's lamp would extinguish it. In the case of fracture of the vacuum tube, while the lamp is lighted, there is almost a certainty of the simultaneous breaking and consequent extinction of the incandescent filament; but even supposing that this did not occur, all danger arising from this accident happening at the precise time and place when and where fire-damp is present in dangerous quantities, might be completely guarded against by the adoption of the expedient suggested by Professor Tyndall—the placing of the lamp in a glass vessel of water. A Swan lamp, thus protected, seems to me all that is required as far as safety is concerned; but it has two practical objections—viz. the expense and inconvenience of carrying wires about underground, and its want of portability. The first, I think, might be overcome. Can scientific men find a remedy for the second?

Shortly, there are, in my opinion, but two problems before us. We must either have light without heat, or a lamp so constructed that, without sacrifice of portability, its heat cannot be communicated to the fire-damp. These problems are no doubt difficult of solution, but I hope not impossible; for I feel assured that, so long as coal is mined from gaseous seams, no precautions that we can adopt, short of these, will provide a radical cure for explosions in collieries.

J. H. MERIVALE.

FIRE-DAMP.

THE great interest which Mr. Samuel Plimsoll has taken in the welfare of sailors has been very naturally extended to colliers, as shown by his article on 'Explosions in Collieries and their Cure' in the *Nineteenth Century* of December last; but as he disowns special knowledge of the subject, and states his object in writing to be that of starting on foot 'a systematic and painstaking investigation of the nature and relations of light carburetted hydrogen,' it would ill become me to criticise his paper except when pointing out errors which, from the circumstances of the case, clash with my argument.

It is of doubtful accuracy to say that much mischief arises 'because men will not learn, and will not obey, the physical laws of the universe.' Mr. Plimsoll must bear in mind that knowledge is progressive, and that science frequently suspects long before proof can be reached. Indeed, I am inclined to take a different view; for my practical experience tells me men will learn, and do obey, the laws of nature, when there is convincing proof, but they are slow before proof, and, for the sake of stability, rightly so.

The first great step towards the abolition of anything is to discover its source; and as light carburetted hydrogen, or marsh gas, called in the formulas of chemistry CH_4 , is the cause of explosions in collieries, we should find its origin; but whereas that was not practicable two years ago, it seems so now, and if I have not actually solved the problem, at least I am not far off doing so.

Let me first ask attention to the average of constituents in the construction of plants and coal:—

	Plants,	Coal,
Carbon	46·0	82·0
Hydrogen	5·6	5·6
Oxygen	41·0	6·0
Nitrogen	2·1	1·2
Ash	5·3	5·2
	<u>100·0</u>	<u>100·0</u>

Here we have before us a visible explanation in figures of the change

that has taken place during the process of carbonising. The proportion of carbon has almost doubled, and seven-eighths ($\frac{7}{8}$) of the oxygen, and one-half the nitrogen, have disappeared, leaving the hydrogen free to form hydrocarbon compounds, while the ash remains the same.

Now what has become of the portion of gases shown in the plants, but which do not appear in the coal? Surely they are still in the coal strata, but in changed combinations, forming varied compounds of which the special object of our inquiry, carburetted hydrogen, is one.

The quantity of carbon which will combine with hydrogen is variable, and dependent on the degree of heat present. At a high temperature hydrogen combines with three times its weight of carbon, forming carburetted hydrogen.

I have now brought down my subject to two problems:—

1. During the formation of coal was there sufficient heat to cause a combination between hydrogen and carbon, and, if so, whence is it produced?

2. What circumstances can arise to empower carburetted hydrogen to rush out of the strata with enormous velocity?

Now as to the first. During fermentation great heat is evolved, and that must have been the case in the formation of coal; whether sufficient I am not prepared to say, but there has been another source of heat. Every coal-field has at some period been overlaid by strata which denudation has removed, perhaps 10,000 feet more or less; in which case the heat due to depth would be about 140° Centigrade = 284° Fahrenheit, which would give a pressure of three and a half atmospheres, or, say, of steam 54lbs. on the square inch.

As to the second problem, the matter is of great interest; for the question involved is the vaporising, liquefying, and solidifying of

In order to apply this, it must be understood that the only difference between a gas and a vapour is of degree—a gas being only an attenuated vapour, and a vapour a condensed gas, the visible change resulting from falling temperature or pressure, or a combination of the two.

Carbonic acid gas will condense by the pressure it evolves during generation in a strong closed vessel, and commences to do so when compressed into one thirty-sixth ($\frac{1}{36}$) of its volume. If a valve in the vessel be suddenly opened, snow-like flakes will be formed at a temperature of about -80° C., which is solid carbonic acid, or, in more scientific language, solid carbonic dioxide; but the greater quantity resumes the gaseous state. Now the same law applies to all gases; and since oxygen, hydrogen, and nitrogen have been either vaporised

or liquefied, we see our way to the origin of those 'blowers' which are so ruinous when they get the mastery.

Oxygen will liquefy at a temperature of -65° C. = 85° F. of cold, when under pressure of from four to six atmospheres, and also at the moment when it is allowed to suddenly escape into space from a pressure of about 300 atmospheres. Nitrogen requires 200 and hydrogen 280 atmospheres.

It appears that these gases remain gaseous while kept under pressure (for instance, hydrogen has remained gaseous under 8,000 atmospheres); but they liquefy or vaporise on the instant of being set free after the pressures named, and then expand to their normal condition. Under pressure they have parted with their latent heat, and on sudden release the cold attained is intense beyond understanding, even -300° C.

We have similar effects with compressed air, only in a less degree.

When sinking a shaft a few years ago in North Wales, I found large volumes of carburetted hydrogen in the strata twenty yards or so before reaching the coal, showing the gas to be of recent origin in comparison with the strata; and I feel convinced that those gases are in the strata under enormous pressure, evolved during the process of carbonisation.

I have known a settling down of strata crumple up 14 feet of solid masonry, as though it were paper, at 600 yards deep, which has its effect also on the gases.

Mr. Plimsoll speaks of a pressure of 30 lbs. on the square inch as if it were a great pressure, and of 1,000 cubic feet as if that were a large volume. What will he say of 'blowers,' with 500 lbs. on the square inch, giving a velocity of, say, 550 feet per second, and of counting gas by the million cubic feet? Such are the sort of figures we must use when discussing those colliery explosions which occur on a large scale. It is absurd to imagine the possibility of constructing reservoirs in the roof, as Mr. Plimsoll proposes, as receptacles for the vast volumes of gas given off by a powerful 'blower' that may charge a mile or more of a mine with explosive fire-damp in a few minutes. Allow 400,000 cubic feet to the mile, and the magnitude of his proposed reservoirs will be apparent.

If the difficulty proceeded from a gradual oozing from the strata, the reservoir system might be available; but it is the sudden appearance of vast volumes of gas that is so troublesome, as quantity cannot be foretold.

I have unquestionable evidence that mists from blowers have been seen and passed unnoticed as 'just a little fog' of no moment; but I am now convinced beyond all doubt that the 'little fog' was vapourised carburetted hydrogen, expanding to its normal state of gas

ready to combine with eight volumes of air, and fire the mine if a chance light offered.

Having lived in earthquake lands and heard the subterranean explosions before the shake, I believe the bumps and thumps common to fiery seams are only the sounds of the efforts of condensed gases to expand—incipient earthquakes in real fact.

The remedy is tapping the seams by boring to let the compressed gas escape gradually.

J. D. SHAKESPEAR.

THE BREAKING UP OF THE LAND MONOPOLY.

WHILE it is the habit of certain minds to dwell specially on what they believe to be the fixed and unvarying laws that govern human existence, and to arrive at a knowledge of an absolute criterion from deductions based on these so-called first principles, it is the habit of others to consider the organism and his surroundings as being in a state of perpetual slow change; so that whatever may have been the social laws which have successfully directed our existence in past times, a perpetual modification of these laws is necessary in order to adapt human life at every epoch to its new and altered conditions.

The first mode of mind is the *à priori* or Conservative one; the second the so-called Radical. Nevertheless we shall see that, rightly considered, this latter form of mental structure is the one which accords most truly with the operation of natural laws, and is therefore neither Radical nor revolutionary, since Nature knows nothing of these rapid changes or cataclysms any way in the history of this world's evolution.

There may be, however, and probably are, points of inflection—critical points in the curve of human sociology, moments when the old is breaking up, and a violent birth of the new is forcing itself into existence. These periods of social crisis may be noticed in the history of every nation. The strain between the various particles of the political body increases until the inherent elasticity of the substance is exceeded. There is a falling apart of the molecules, and a rearrangement of their respective positions with regard to one another becomes a vital necessity. What we have therefore to seek for is that condition of stable equilibrium in the social body where the powers of restitution are complete; and thus, without arriving at that position of rest which is unknown in the physical as well as in the political world, the various members of the social body may ever oscillate about a centre of equilibrium.

There is no question that has so comprehensive an aspect, when judged of by these ideas, as the elementary right of property. The right of every individual to live, and the further right to enjoy the fruits of his own toil, are the axioms from which we can deduce every rational social law. These are the 'natural rights' of an individual

or of a race that has risen above the state of savagedom, and has mutually consented to establish a code, written or implied, in the place of the law of battle and the survival of the fittest.

The first among the rights of property which must have occupied the thoughts of men before manufactures and arts were known, were the rights connected with land. Land was the sole source of all wealth, the sole instrument of production, the most certain or tangible form of all property. The original title to land must naturally have been in most cases simply the right of the strongest, yet it would seem that the rights acquired by occupancy were never totally ignored. Even among the early serf populations of Europe the right of these serfs to occupy the soil which they had for generations cultivated grew up gradually to be recognised by the seignorial class, and fiefs and grants of land, either on feudal tenure or on a payment of 'cens,' were a species of recognition of the claims of the cultivating class to certain rights of occupancy amounting in many cases to fixity of tenure, which thus became a species of feudal copyhold subject only to those rights of the seigneur which a powerful and insolent nobility have in all countries and in every age forced upon the classes beneath them, as far as they felt they could safely go without absolutely starving the population who produced the wealth which they enjoyed, or exposing themselves to the fury of a general insurrection.

Of these feudal customs De Tocqueville¹ says: 'Toute institution qui a été longtemps dominante après s'être établie dans sa sphère naturelle, pénètre au-delà et finit par exercer une grande influence sur la partie de la législation où elle ne règne pas.'

To these customs he attributes the great inequalities in the disposition of property and laws of inheritance which had infiltrated themselves as a practice into ranks of life far below the noble class, and had been the source of so much evil to the French peasantry.

The history of landed property in England has in many ways been very different, though the spirit which has pervaded its laws has in former times been very similar. Feudalism never actively survived as it did abroad. The dissimilarity of interest and condition between the free burghers of the towns and the serf peasantry outside had no part in our system. The landed aristocracy were not an absentee class as they were abroad, living perpetually about the Court. Their estates, too, which in many cases may be traced to grants from the Crown of what were once Church lands, were mixed up and interspersed with those of the small proprietors of the yeoman class, who of late years have vanished completely. This latter class, which at one time formed one of the most valuable elements in our social economy, were eliminated by the growing facilities of intercommunication even before railway and telegraph were introduced.

¹ *L'Ancien Régime*, p. 315.

Life became too dear for small landed proprietors to keep up the old appearances of living which they had been used to; they became swamped by the moneyed classes from the towns, and they found that, by selling their estates to new men or to the large landed owners, they could live in towns and keep up a position which they were unable to do in the face of the modern competition for aggregating vast estates. Besides the existence of this yeoman class, who were totally distinct from any class that we find on the Continent, there was another difference between the conditions of landed property in England and abroad. The peasant cultivator was never a prominent institution in England, as he was over four-fifths of the Continent. This is largely to be accounted for by the fact that the love of an outdoor life in the country has always been a leading feature of the English character. Every man who had wealth of any sort invested it in land which he either farmed himself or let, preferring the position of a squire or gentleman to that of a simple *rentier* or *bourgeois*. Abroad, if a man was born in a town, he and his family lived there for ever; in England he took the first opportunity fortune offered him of leaving the town and buying property in the country.

Again, the great rise and growth of our manufacturing industries in the beginning of the century in England tended largely to draw off the attention of the people from simple agricultural life. Neither have great famines, such as other countries have suffered from in consequence of ruinous wars, thrown back the people on the land as the sole means of existence. Our foreign trade even before the repeal of the corn laws saved us from these dangers; while, on the other hand, for many years our manufactures and the prospects of emigration steadily drew off the superabundance of population to our colonies or to our home centres of manufacturing industry. Lastly, the demands of our fleet and army, as well as of our mercantile marine, afforded a perpetual opening to that spirit of enterprise and adventure which is so marked a feature in our history.

We thus see that for many years, whether for good or evil, the mass of the people of England, unlike those of foreign countries, have lived independent of, if not estranged from, the soil; our prosperity has been a mercantile and manufacturing, not to say artificial, prosperity. Those who have remained as simple labourers on the land have, as a rule, been the least intelligent, the least enterprising. The people themselves have had no lien on the land. 'Earth-hunger' has never arisen as yet in England.*

All these tendencies working together have, as it were, deferred in

* Speaking on the Irish land question on the 17th of May, 1866, Mr. S. Mill said: 'The Irish circumstances and the Irish ideas as to social and agricultural economy are the general ideas and circumstances of the human race. It is the English ideas and circumstances that are peculiar. Ireland is in the main stream of human existence and human feeling and opinion. It is England that is in one of the lateral channels.'

England the land crisis which has taken place of recent years in every other country of Europe, and which has resulted in the transfer of the land, in one way or another, in Denmark, Bavaria, most of Germany and Poland, from the hands of the aristocratic class into those of occupying owners cultivating their lands themselves.

It is highly doubtful if the continent of Europe will ever offer an exact parallel to England in her methods of agriculture or customs and laws regarding land, nor is it necessary that we should look abroad for an absolute guide. The criterion must be sought for from among the necessities of the English people; and the first primary necessity is 'that the land should be made to produce as much as is possible, and that those who live upon it should be contented and happy.'

The great landowners, whether the nobles or, in her day, the Church, did their part fairly well towards their immediate dependents in this country; nevertheless the system of paternal government which is an inevitable accompaniment of the alliance that has always existed between the Church and ancient feudal ideas, is unsuited, if not absolutely debasing, to the spirit of the people. The first quality of the individual—namely, 'independence of character' and self-reliance—is strenuously discouraged and looked upon with the greatest disfavour, if not at once repressed, by both clergy and squire; and the species of offensive and defensive alliance which these two, often very opposite-minded, persons invariably arrive at, is highly prejudicial to the independence of the people, either morally, socially, or intellectually.

In their own particular spheres both these parties may have been possessed of worthy motives after their own lights; but the ineradicable feudal feeling of the landed class towards those whom they have treated more or less in the light of vassals, and the acquiescence of the clergy in these pretensions, have for years been the cause of the permanence of that species of patriarchal government of which our unpaid magistracy is the outward and visible sign, but of which the inward strength has been that survival of medieval notions and assertion of superior authority by the landed class which remain in full force in England to the present day in most of her country districts.

The history of the power of the landed classes in England is well set forth by Sir E. May in his *Democracy in Europe*. He shows us how, since the reign of William, the House of Commons had become a sort of close body, representing, no doubt, more or less the opinions of the country, but more particularly the views of the landed interest; the country members were largely nominees of the great territorial nobles, and bribery and corruption were acknowledged as legitimate functions of every government. By these means the landed aristocracy virtually ruled the State and

manipulated the House of Commons—the real power of the Crown had passed, and in its place the oligarchy of a landed class had risen on its ashes. The Whigs, who had brought in the new *régime*, adhered to Liberal opinions, and the rivalry of parties kept the State from stagnation. Freedom thus remained, and powerful middle classes were gradually growing up—the Church, the nobles, and the country gentry ruled—they built noble mansions, laid out woods and parks, and as leaders of society, as magistrates, they enjoyed the power without possessing the invidious privileges of feudalism. The country gentry and aristocracy went hand in hand, the clergy were largely recruited from their ranks, they owed their benefices to the peer and the squire, and thus this triumvirate formed a most powerful society, commanding almost political supremacy, until another class was destined to rise and contest their power—a phenomenon which has revealed itself so strongly in later times.³

An acknowledgment must in fairness be conceded to the great interest which English landowners have generally taken in their estates, and the hearty recognition of many of its paternal obligations. Yet we must not forget the words before quoted of De Tocqueville; and it is a great and open question whether the paramount influence which the landed aristocracy have exercised for so many generations on those beneath them, can, in the long run, continue to be for the unmixed good and welfare of the people.

The signs of change in these respects are not wanting; the efforts which have been made in late years to secularise popular education and render it compulsory have not been without effect. The Ballot Act has largely reduced the political power of the landowning class, upon which the great Reform Bill first put a certain limit. The monopoly which, however, has so long existed is not so easily destroyed; the Church and the landed interest still fight hand in hand, and offer, each in its own way, a bitter opposition to every measure for the public good, which is calculated to impair the remnants of their joint authority. The Burials Bill and Game Act of last year—two of the most moderate measures ever proposed by a Liberal Ministry—were fought against in a spirit of the most violent hostility; the reform of county management, the extension of the county suffrage, and redistribution of seats will also meet with the most energetic resistance from the landowning class, who will employ every artifice and conjure up every imaginable party cry to discredit these measures of reform, which they know are surely coming, but which they think themselves bound in honour to obstruct as long as they are able. Yet if the agricultural classes are to be raised intellectually and morally, it must be by teaching them responsibility; and the conferring of the franchise on the agricultural labourer, however little he may at first understand its duties, is the

³ Précis from May's *Democracy in Europe*, p. 443.

first practical step in making him realise his stake and interest in the country. The Tory leaders are not adverse to forming 'Conservative working men's associations' (whatever this nondescript term may mean), and they are equally ready to deliver speeches on all questions of interest of the day to large assemblies of the 'unenfranchised labourers.' They fail to recognise, however, that the genius of the nineteenth century is not favourable to the permanence of feudal customs, or a survival of paternal government, notwithstanding all their efforts to persuade the yokels to the contrary.

The tenant farmers of England have occupied a peculiar position in the bucolic economy: they have been an auxiliary class between the landowner and the labourer; they have accepted, and honestly too, the interests of the landlords, who, in their turn, have made every effort to conciliate the farmers with 'soft words,' if not always by liberal deeds. The landlords have certainly never relaxed their right, so long as they were able to enforce it, of controlling their tenants' votes, or of quatering on them as much game as they would stand without giving up their farms. They have carefully for generations regulated the cropping of the land, and reserved to themselves the right to evict at their pleasure. In fact, they have universally secured to themselves all the rights of residential advantage, and conceded in many ways nothing but the burdens of cultivation. It is true that they have done all the permanent improvements in the way of building, such as they have been; but the question of improving the productive power of the land by encouraging higher farming has been an impossibility under such a state of arrangements, the consequence being that too often the farmer himself has sunk into a general state of apathy, and fails to see how much he might profit by a better system. Yet the Conservative party have persistently urged that they alone are the farmers' friends; that the interests of landlords and tenants are identical. The former of these propositions is manifestly false, as any person with an eye to fact can perceive; the latter should be true as a general theory regarding every species of joint undertaking; but, so far as the land goes, while the interests of the parties have been identical, their '*objects*,' as Mr. Bear shows in his article in the September number of the *Nineteenth Century*, 1879, are by no means equally identical.

Things, however, are rapidly changing, and we are at present entering on a momentous period in the history of the land question; a critical point, in fact, in its history, such as we have not seen since the days of the great Reform Bill. Up to now the tenant farmer has been contented to accept the position of the disestablished British yeoman, who had certain social pretensions about him, which would have brought him in many ways into conflict with the great landowners.

Another distinctive feature of the tenant farmer's life of the

present day is its nomadic character, whatever it may have been a hundred years ago. He wanders from place to place, often changing his farm for trifling reasons; he feels no tie in the land, he has entered farming as an occupation or trade because he has been brought up to it by his father, or he has been a man who has made money in towns by mercantile enterprise in a small way, such as licensed victualling, brewing, &c. These men often bring with them to their farms capital ranging from a few hundreds to several thousand pounds. Below this wealthier class of farmers there are to be found in the neighbourhood of country towns many smaller men who do not aspire to keep hunters and give their daughters an education at fashionable boarding-schools; this class have more of the working element about them, they do their farm labour pretty much themselves, and have little time for simple pleasure or amusement. It is noteworthy of this class that during the present agricultural depression they have in almost every district steadily paid their rent, where larger men have all failed.

It should, however, be remembered that the tenant farmers of England have in many ways been an ornament and a pride to this country; and while they have always displayed the most laudable desire to live on terms of friendly interest with their landlords, they have in some countries, as notably in Scotland, practised agriculture as a science, although in too many cases of late they have failed to make it a profitable transaction. Why? Is it American competition, bad seasons, high rent? They will tell you that these are the chief causes. The real reason, however, does not lie here; the true cause of agricultural difficulties in England must be sought for from two sources: (1) Economic laws; (2) Present methods of agriculture.

Broadly speaking, the profitable cultivation of land in this country is only possible where farming on a large scale is carried on by the owner of the land who possesses a large capital as well as other sources of revenue which can tide him over bad times, or where the land is held by a small class of farmers who have every security given them for their capital, and who bring to the undertaking their own personal labour and that of their family.

We do not require to subdivide land here, as it is in France, Belgium, Switzerland, &c., or certainly not as it is in Ireland. Nevertheless, though it will grievously offend many farmers to tell them so—the truth is best before all things—‘the gentleman farmer’ is an impossibility. In no part of the civilised world, not even in fertile America or the colonies, does a man suppose that he can make a living out of the land by investing capital in a farm worked solely by hired labour and for which he pays a full rent, his general superintendence of farming operations being the only function which the farmer supplies in the undertaking. Agricultural profits, as every farmer well knows, are a matter of very narrow margins between ex-

penditure and receipt; and it is only the man who works on the very largest scale, possessing a large capital at his back, with full, not limited right of ownership, together with considerable scientific knowledge and intelligent foresight, who can make this class of farming pay. The other alternative is the working man whose whole individual energy and thought are given to the care of a small farm where his own labour is the principal factor, and where he feels that every yard of manure he produces, every ditch, every drain he digs means so many pence or pounds added to his next year's income.

This class of tenant cannot exist at present under the conditions of limited ownership by which four-fifths of English land is tied up in strict settlement; but when the Legislature decrees that he shall exist—or, what is the same thing, allows the natural operation of economic laws to evolve him—we shall hear a very different tale regarding English agriculture. Our present class of tenant farmers must face their fate boldly; they had better retire from the business if they wish to live in dignity and ease, and invest their capital in more profitable undertakings, or they must in a great majority of cases reduce the size of their farms, cultivate higher, and bring more of their own personal labour to the work; and if they show themselves ready to do these things, which we have not the slightest reason to doubt, it becomes the imperative duty of the Legislature to abolish once for all every restriction that has operated so disadvantageously in the past in restricting the efficiency of agriculture in this country.

It cannot be very long, either, before we shall have to do justice to the great unenfranchised class of agricultural labourers. The effect of the last ten years of the new system of general elementary education is happily beginning to tell somewhat on his intellectual condition; the labourer is day by day becoming more fitted to exercise this privilege, yet his home condition is in many ways most wretched and backward. It is true that, rough though his life is, it is healthier and better in every way than that of the mechanic who lives in the squalid lanes and alleys of manufacturing towns. Even this class, however, are improving; and it is to be hoped that before long the various schemes for improving the dwellings of artisans will have so far done their work as not only to render it possible for the industrious mechanic to become the owner of his house, but that his less fortunate fellow-workmen will simply refuse to be quartered in the dens which they too often still are compelled to live in from want of better accommodation being obtainable. There is no reason why the farm labourer should be less well housed than the mechanic, and every encouragement should be given him to be able to become the owner of his cottage and garden.

Yet we must not expect much assistance here from the land-owning class, who, although, so far as their limited means allow them, they have endeavoured of late years to improve largely the condition

of their cottage property, have no wish to see the farm labourer independent; the hold they have over him by the yearly rental of a good cottage at a moderate rent is a considerable source of indirect influence in a country district. In many ways the general condition of the labourer in England is more backward than in any other civilised country of Europe; the more enterprising and intelligent are drawn off to the towns and manufactures, and those that remain live a narrow torpid existence unrelieved by any interest sufficient to raise them to a better position. The influence of the clergy, though often of great value in times of distress, is too often calculated to enervate the energies of the people, and teach them to look for help and charity where thrift, economy, and independence would be better guides. Much of the emotional character of the religion of the poorer class is to be attributed to the complete absence of any interest or stake in life beyond the earning of a weekly wage, which they can never hope to increase all their lives, and which sickness or age may rob them of. Their benefit societies have done some good, yet they have been timidly or injudiciously worked. There are often far too many of them. They have yet to learn the true method of 'co-operation' and mutual insurance, those two great incentives to saving and the forming of joint-stock capital. Thus it happens that the greatest enemies of the agricultural poor are often the small tradesmen of country villages, who force the labourer to deal at their shops by keeping him in their debt, and who are in many cases the least improving owners of cottage property.

Consider, again, the matter of education. There is still a rage to teach children everything or anything but their own language or the principles of their future occupation. The village boy is still taught the history of the Norman kings and the latitude of the Cape of Good Hope, while he is never helped to think for himself by studying Nature at first hand. Practical lessons in gardening or agriculture, readings or easy discourses on English literature, would give the lad a chance hereafter. His future occupations in life would not be entirely divorced, as they are at present, from his early training, and he would not after a few years at the plough have forgotten the greatest part of what was once dinned into him. Let anybody who cares for the subject study the method of boys' and girls' education in the Swiss primary schools, and let any one who has travelled attentively through Switzerland and conversed with her people compare the condition of the English agricultural class with that of Switzerland; let him look at the same time at the generally diffused knowledge of agriculture, the intelligence and independence of the people, and then let him come back and maintain, if he can, that our agricultural communities are not a standing disgrace to the richest country in Europe.

Every one would profit by the improvement in the condition of the agricultural labourer. The farmer would obtain a more efficient

workman; and with more intelligent and useful education, together with the advantages of good cottages and gardens, the labourer would soon realise fresh interests in life. He would put forth energies which have, under his present monotonous condition, long lain dormant, but which, with the prospect before him of being able to rise by his own exertions, and become the owner of his own home, or the tenant or possessor of a small farm, would soon develop habits of thrift and economy to which he has long been a stranger, and which the operation of our Poor Law has long tended to make him disregard.

Thus far we have considered mainly the leading features of the problem, so far as they affect the general methods of agriculture as practised in this country. We have traced rapidly the respective positions which the landlord class, the farmers, and the labourers occupy with regard to one another 'socially.' We must now return to the other question which we left behind, namely, the 'economic aspect' of the case. Every political question naturally divides itself under these two heads; and that institution is the most perfect one in which, after equating the two sides to one another, we find that the terms mutually cancel, in the sense that for every economic gain, which a law or custom confers on a people, we have a corresponding social advantage. No human institution probably fully answers to this test, and therefore it is by striking a balance between these two that we are able to judge how far the expense to the State is justified by the excellence of the institution socially.

This point of view is often overlooked by politicians in judging the merit of existing institutions; the Tory mind fondly dwelling on the advantages which the English people possess in the existence of various social grades, each offering so many steps along which the individual can rise till he eventually obtains an entrance into the magic circle of an hereditary chamber, as a reward for services rendered to the State, or as a tribute to his intellectual or financial capacities. The family-founding instinct is thus encouraged, and the desire to perpetuate a monument to genius is fostered by the creation of laws which tend to protect from the ravages of time many large hereditary properties and historical families, whose names are co-existent with English history. To this end attempts have been successfully made to popularise our social laws, and the landed aristocracy has been largely recruited from among the ranks of the people; so that in England we have no parallel whatever in the condition of its aristocracy to the exclusive pretensions of the *Ebenbürtigkeit* of Germany, or the narrow sympathies of the French faubourg. Radical politicians, on the other hand, who are less impressed with the historical associations of our Constitution, see in the existence of a privileged class nothing but an unmixed evil; they consider solely the economic view of the question, and they argue with great show of

justice that our social institutions, especially as they affect the land, are a standing burden on the industry of the people. It is the duty of the intelligent statesman to strike a balance between these contending lines of argument; and it is the interest of the landed class themselves to study the problem carefully as it presents itself to us in the present distressed state of agriculture, and to concede willingly from out of the plenitude of their privileges every modification which is necessary for the well-being of the country, and for the future permanence of their own order.

There have been times when, inspired by irresistible impulse, nations, like individuals, have thrown aside the quieter methods of discussion, and in a period of social revolution have abolished and overthrown the right of favoured minorities in the same manner as a bankrupt State repudiates its engagements. In a more ordered community, however, it is the right of every people to extinguish at pleasure its liabilities by fair means. The rights and privileges of a class which have gradually been permitted to grow up, cannot be rudely put aside; the country is bound to recognise its liabilities, and to pay off its bondholders at par, whether they be landowners or simply possessors of public scrip. All schemes of radical legislation are, therefore, to be deprecated; they could only be carried out at the expense of great injustice to individual rights, or at a ruinous cost to the taxpaying community. What we require from our lawgivers are certain prompt and efficient modifications of existing laws, which, without disregarding the time-honoured lines of our existing Constitution, shall infuse into our land laws a new vitality, and adapt them to the ever-altering conditions of a true civilisation.

The great evil of the present state of things is the highly 'artificial,' not to say unstable, condition of our national prosperity, so long as we depend solely on our manufacturing activity as a source of national wealth. The Tories have urged that, since Free Trade is a recognised principle, it matters but little whence our sources of food are derived, so long as a fair field is open to everybody, our supplies being more cheaply produced abroad than in England. The misfortune is, that in a rich country like England, the tendency of a certain class is to consider that the land can be made the playground for the rich without any hurtful effect to the people. This is not the case, and the country is as deeply interested in the general productive efficiency of the soil as it is in any of its manufacturing industries. It has been argued by many writers that, if the producing power of the land were increased, we should be saved yearly the whole amount which we now pay for imported food. Taking our whole yearly home produce at 230 to 250 millions, and our imports of grain and cattle at 100 millions,⁴ let us suppose that by improved methods one-fourth were gained in annual produce—

⁴ Boyd Kinnear, *Principles of Property in Land*, p. 71.

about fifty millions—and that we saved, therefore, the cost of carriage from America of this amount of food, namely, 10s. a quarter on wheat, this alone would give us a gain of eleven millions annually, equal at 3 per cent. to the interest of nearly half the national debt. We thus see that the application of labour to manufactures instead of to agriculture is not such a matter of indifference to the welfare of the country; for better methods mean more labour employed, and, therefore, wages coming into Englishmen's pockets instead of going to American wheat-growers for the supplies we have to purchase.

Nothing has operated more perniciously in keeping up these artificial conditions than the laws of primogeniture or, more properly speaking, the custom of entail on the one unborn. Entail itself, which dates back to the thirteenth century, was abolished by the courts in the sixteenth. Thellusson's Act, in George the Third's reign, forbade the accumulation of real or personal estate for more than twenty-one years after the death of the testator. There is, however, a law by which estates in land may be limited to the life of one holder, and a testator may name a succession of such heirs, provided they be living at the time the deed is executed. Moreover, though entail was abolished, the heir of entail is not bound to resettle the property; the old entail is good unless the heir chooses to set it aside, which the law gave him power to do. Thus the tenant for life is in the habit of making terms with the heir of entail, and prevails on him to mortgage his inheritance in fee, for the consideration of a yearly provision during the life of the present owner; and by this means the custom is kept up from generation to generation, a fresh deed being executed each time the heir of entail marries or attains his majority. Neither can the heir well refuse this arrangement, since he is entirely dependent on the present owner for means of existence during the life of the said owner. Charges of every description are thus placed upon the land every generation, for younger children or for debts incurred by the contracting parties to the deed; and thus the burdens on an estate accumulate, to what extent is unknown except to the family lawyer, since there is no obligation on a mortgagor to publish the charges on his property. The tenant for life is thus often placed in a most embarrassing position; he cannot keep up his position as he would wish, and yet he either cannot or is unwilling to sell and clear the property; on the other hand, his heir may be, as is unfortunately too often the case, highly distasteful to him, and he therefore feels no wish to lay out his own money on a property which must by law come to a person whom he little cares for; he would naturally sooner save for those whom he loves; and thus the property is starved, and the money which should be expended on it is kept back.

The power of mortgaging land is an active source of general embarrassment; it encourages owners to keep land when it would be for the

advantage of the community that it should be sold, and it renders the process of simplifying transfers nugatory. If land were liable for debt in the same manner as personalty now is, it would be impossible to create preferential charges which would hold good against all other claims; money might still be borrowed for temporary purposes, according as the credit of the individual was good or bad; but it certainly is an open and debatable question whether the principle of mortgages should not be totally abolished, and the practice of making charges and settlements in trust of 'agricultural' land generally illegal.

However this might be, a limitation might be fixed by law, regulating the number of years' rental it should be legal to charge on a property,⁵ and these charges should be compulsorily registered in a public Government office.

If it be considered necessary to afford a special protection to the holders of titles or landed families, a Government trust office might be established, where the settlement of estates should be registered, the amount of estate settled to be limited to the houses, parks, and home farms of landowners, while provision might be made for settling money in the public funds to produce a sufficient income for their maintenance and that of their owners. The creation of a public trustee would be a great convenience for all persons wishing to make settlements of funds for the purpose of family arrangement; and there would be no objection, in the interest of the general public, that public funds or other safe scrip should be thus settled for specific purposes.

Moreover, if any effectual remedy is to be applied to cheapen and simplify the process of land transfers, it is absolutely necessary that some limit should be put on the powers possessed by owners of real property to create charges of every description on their property. A simple registration of titles in a public office and the shortening of legal deeds will effect nothing until the title itself is simplified, by limiting the charges and encumbrances which property is now made to bear under so-called deeds of entail or marriage settlements. Land is a different form of property from all others in one sense only; namely, its immovability. All other natural agents are liable to decay, waste, or removal. Land alone, therefore, offers the temptation to its owner to anticipate its productive value, and burden it with charges which must materially affect its usefulness to its possessor. It is, therefore, not the business of the Legislature to encourage a landowning class to burden their properties by mortgages, which are simply a form of preferential debt which the State renders it legal to effect on this species of property. This argument

⁵ In the Duke of Leinster's interview with his tenantry, on the 18th of December 1880, he is reported to have given as his reason for inability to reduce his rents more than 10 per cent., that the charges on his property amounted to *half a million* of money.

does not apply with regard to mercantile stock, &c., such as railway plant, for the natural operation of trade here regulates the amount of preferential stock it is safe to put on the market; and since in these cases there is no false family pride of possession to be met with as a factor in the problem, an industrial speculation soon finds its own level, the company is liquidated, the capital is destroyed, a new company is formed, but no natural agent is permanently reduced to an unproductive condition.

The present system of land transfer, custom of primogeniture, and settlement is the result of many ancient customs and laws, traceable in their origin to a worthy pride in family fame and dignity of race. The desire to create a family who shall represent a social unit of merit and distinction is a valuable and legitimate object for any man to strive for, and we should be careful to maintain rather than to destroy the conditions under which these aspirations can take root among a people. They conduce directly to patriotic action in the individual and in the family; they have proved themselves in history to have operated as powerful motives in inducing men to sacrifice their talents and their lives to the welfare of the State; and they have been directly instrumental in developing some of our best family instincts. Such aspirations are not to be reduced to a mere logical form; they are the direct product of the sentimental and less tangible component of human motives; nevertheless, they are valuable as tending to turn men away from simple individual selfishness, and a disregard for all posterity. In order that these valuable moral attributes in a people may be preserved and encouraged, we must be careful not to kill while we are attempting to prune a tree which, though by process of growth, has somewhat overspread its proper area, and even for its own benefit and rejuvenation requires judicious curtailment. Let us remember, if ever overcome by a renovating rage, that it is an unwise policy of rulers to endeavour to eliminate individualism. The interest of the many is a grand object, and humanitarianism is a worthy creed; yet like every other exalted object, like every transcendental creed, it will never prove the '*live motive*' of the mass, however fervently it may be preached. The first instinct of our nature is individualism, the second sociology, and whatever be the perfectibility which the human race is capable of, the first factor of civilisation can never be ignored; therefore it should be by modifying along the old lines and adapting from ancient usages that we must look to alter these customs of entail, land transfer, and power of settlement so as to suit them to the changing conditions of the nineteenth century.

The amount of landed property which it is for the advantage of the people to permit the accumulation of in the hands of any one owner is as difficult to determine as the amount of personal riches, which we have in this century seen made in business and trade, would

be easy to limit or control. The system of land tax or progressive income tax are so many deterrents to the industry of a people and the productiveness of capital. The power of the State to limit the testamentary power of the individual is an unquestionable right; the power to devise by will is a social custom limited by its usefulness. There is no inherent right to property after death; the State might without direct injustice sequester the whole. The inordinate veneration with which it has been the habit in England to surround the provisions of a will, however ridiculous or unfair they may be, is a most peculiar feature of our civilisation, and there is no subject which in its bearing on the whole land question requires modification so much as this absolute power which a testator now possesses of stretching forth his hand beyond the tomb to perpetrate an injustice or gratify revenge! We do not need the Code Napoléon in England, which operates to encourage jealousy among the children towards the father where the differences of age are not considerable, and which largely discourages energy and enterprise; but while, in the first place, we require the immediate abolition of the law of intestacy, *i.e.* the law of primogeniture, we require a limitation of the power of owners of property to exclude any one of the children they may have brought into the world, or, in default of children, their nearest relatives, from a just share of the reversion to the testator's property. The widow's share should also be fixed by law. Scotch law has recognised this principle, and a share of the personalty is inalienably fixed as the portion of the widow and younger children. The custom of primogeniture has long existed in this country; and, although it can be defended on no exact logical grounds, it is a practice which has operated less harmfully than many others connected with the land question. It has its faults and it has its merits; there is no reason why the eldest, more than any other, should be made the favoured individual, the representative of the family unit; yet as long as we accept the aristocratic principle and continue to confer peerages for public services to the State, which peerages are transmitted to the descendant, we must elect for some particular line of succession. Every country has had a different custom. In Germany the 'Fideicommiss' was of several forms—the uncle, the eldest son, the youngest have been made the heirs of titles and entail; yet, whatever arbitrary system we do adopt, the point to be dealt with is to limit the power of the testator in gratifying his family-founding instinct or desire for unworthy revenge, and to secure by law a certain fixed proportion of a man's goods devolving to his other children, more especially the daughters. It is the strange custom in England for a man to bequeath the whole of his property, of say fifty to one hundred thousand a year, to his eldest son, and to settle on the younger children collectively a sum of often not more than one year's income; the daughters when they marry having seldom for-

tunes exceeding ten thousand pounds, certainly not sufficient to keep them in the position of life that they have been brought up to.

Apart from these questions which affect the distribution of property in land, we have the serious question of its management; and the leading question which assails us here is the vexed matter of security to the occupier of the soil for improvement effected by him, which the landlord is now in the habit of securing largely to himself in the form of increased rent. No part of the whole land question is so involved as this. The interests of the two contracting parties, the tenant and the landowner, are so difficult of adjustment by law, and the various remedies that have been proposed have been so far from meeting with the approval of both parties, that it is difficult to foresee the right solution. There is no subject which the various clubs and chambers of agriculture discuss more keenly than this branch of the subject. The London Farmers' Club and the Farmers' Alliance have each proposed solutions of the problem, and in the way of legislative measures we have had the Agricultural Holdings Act of the late Government, of which all that can be said is that a weaker or more effete measure was never passed; since, while it conceded the principle that the landlord had no right to a tenant's improvement, it passed a measure the only effect of which would be to insure that no tenant would be so foolish as to make any improvements at all.⁶ The proper function for the State to fulfil is not to enforce any one particular class of contract, or to draw any hard and fast line by which the contracting parties must be bound. It is the business of the State to interpret existing customs, and to determine by presumption, in the absence of any special agreement, what are the respective claims of the two parties. The Irish Land Act of 1870 has rightly been conceived as a measure of this sort. It simply rendered binding by law what had been largely a custom; and if we find it necessary to extend this measure to fixity of tenure for fair rents and fair sale in Ireland, it is because the custom is more or less implied in equitable arrangements, though there is difficulty in defining the right in each particular case.

In England we have several different land customs, and it depends on the farming class themselves to modify these customs by refusing to take land unless they are met in a fair spirit by their landlords.

It is unlikely in England that we shall ever have the same competition for farms as there has been in Ireland, and hence no tenant right (which is practically a residential value) can be created by the occupier. Yet there remain the questions, In what way are we to encourage tenants to invest more capital in farming by giving them *by law* some protection for the state of cultivation they have raised

* As Mr. Boyd Kinnear says, if the Act had provided that the value for improvements should hold unless *both* parties chose to put it aside, it would have been quite another matter. As it was, an opportunity was given to either party to make the Act of no effect, 'without substituting any other contract.'

the land to? and, How are we to insure that the landlord shall not acquire these advantages by raising his rent? The answer to this question is, that it is simply impossible to step in and dictate to either party what contract shall be made. The freedom of trade requires that each side to a bargain should be free to make his own terms; and all that the State can do is to step in, in the absence of any other agreement, and decide the right which shall be recognised by law as appertaining to each side. The farmer is, in most cases, perfectly capable of taking care of himself, and we can no more by law regulate the rent of land than we can fix the price of a quatern loaf. All that we can do is to turn the occupier into a copyholder by giving him the three F's; and it should be very clearly understood that this is the unmistakable nature of these famous provisions for the Irish tenant which, it is the belief of many, he has in justice a claim to; while others believe, on the other hand, that if he is to have them given to him he must purchase with his own money.

All these difficulties were met in England under the old patriarchal system by yearly tenancies and undisturbed possession during good behaviour, low rents, and a general display of good feeling and kindly interest on both sides. Much of this old state of things no longer exists; the competitions of life among landowners and new proprietors have raised the general rental of farms; the custom of the country has been disregarded; and in the last twenty years we have seen an increase in the rent of agricultural land of over 20 per cent., which state of things is rapidly working out its own cure to-day.

Thus it has happened that the leasing of land has taken, in many cases, the place of the old year-to-year custom, twenty-one-year leases being granted to tenants with capital, as is the custom in Scotland. The objection to twenty-one-year leases to a small tenant is, however, the same as the objection any one of us would have to purchasing the tail-end of a town lease. We should certainly be protected against having our rent arbitrarily raised by our landlord, but we should have got a thoroughly unsaleable article; and if one of us were to die or change our mode of life, there is no one who would purchase the remainder of the lease from us except the landlord; in fact, we should be saddled with an unwished-for contract. Thus a small farmer, who dreads the uncertainty of the seasons and the advent of bad times, gains nothing by having a lease for twenty-one years; he is infinitely better off, as all of them will admit, as a yearly tenant with a 'two' years' notice to quit; in fact he would prefer this to anything. It remains, however, to be considered how far it might not be advisable for owners of property to sell leases of their farms for fifty to one hundred years on fines which would represent say one-fourth of the rental capitalised. It would then be in the power of a small farmer to lay out some hundreds in purchasing a lease in the same way as a man invests in house property in towns. He

might erect buildings on it, or do any other sort of improvement, and feel sure that, if anything happened to him, his heirs would be able to realise the value of his expenditure by the enhanced price the lease would fetch in the market ; there would be nothing either to stop the landowner's entering into a contract with the tenant to agree to certain permanent improvements, such as farm buildings, being revalued at the expiration of a lease, and the tenant would have no difficulty in obtaining advances on easy terms from the local banks for improvements of an exhaustible nature, or for helping him in bad times. Such a system of loans would be far more profitably and economically spent than where estates are managed, as they must be, by agents, when of inordinate size.

Land would come to be a form of investment like the funds ; the cultivator would be free, and large estates would cease to be as common as they are now. A landowner would not care for more property than he could manage himself personally, and his park, woods, and home farms would represent his own personal stake in the agricultural interests of the country. This would be in the end a far happier and easier state of things for the landowner than the constant source of care which the deputed agency of a large property gives, while it yields none of the personal and political power it used to do. Indirectly the influence of the landowner would be much the same ; he would still, by his position and wealth, possess a considerable stake in the country ; and, while his personal cares and burdens would be lightened, he would be realising a greater profit from his property by saving the expenses of agency and repairs, &c. : while the social and aristocratic privileges of the landowning class would be unimpaired.

It is sometimes asserted that an aristocracy without land is like a king without subjects ; that the possession of large landed estates tends to make the Upper Chamber not only independent of the fickleness of popular opinion, but also to bring it perpetually into harmony with all that is most truly stable and national in public thought. It is urged, moreover, that an aristocracy without land, a house of peers without large estates endowed with the prestige of hereditary transmission, would infallibly sink to a lower level in the estimation of the people, and that the balance of the constitutional principle would be destroyed. The House of Lords is thus supposed not only to represent the landed interest of the country, but also to occupy the often difficult position of a sort of hereditary jury to decide between the conflicting interests of the two great political parties in the State, and it is assumed that its usefulness will be impaired if its peculiar attributes are changed.

It may, however, be doubted if the influence which landed property gives is not to be fully compensated by the possession of personal merit. The interests of the nation require that a better and

larger distribution of landed property should shortly be brought into operation by the modification of certain protective laws. It is idle to contend against these facts, and it would be dangerous for the best interests of the peers themselves were they to fail to recognise these necessities. The cost of their institution to the community might be felt to outweigh the usefulness of their functions, and a feeling might take root of general aversion to the hereditary principle, of which we have seen symptoms in the last session of Parliament. The House of Lords, as an institution representing essentially the landowning class, has survived many dangers in past times, and preserves to the present day an immense indirect influence on our legislative industry. The time is, however, at hand when, if it is to preserve its influence in the State, it will have not only seriously to modify its own constitution, but also to divest itself of that peculiar exclusive landed character it has heretofore possessed. The hereditary character may remain, tempered by judicious selection, and supplemented by the addition of intellectual eminence from other branches of the Legislature.⁷

It is, however, on its own merits, and on the individual character of its members, that it must be able to survive, rather than on the sentimental associations connected with an ancient monument.

Land measures will have to be brought before it, however, which many of its members will believe are destined to threaten the very existence of its constitution. The keynote of these measures was struck last year by no less a person than the late Prime Minister, in his speech on the Game Bill, when he warned the noble Lords that it was not over such small matters that they must waste their thoughts, but rather reserve themselves for that great constitutional battle he felt was coming. The battle will undoubtedly come, and we may expect to see many noble knights appear arrayed for the fray in armour of a very antiquated form, which will be of little avail for modern warfare. Fortunately there are still to be found members of the aristocracy and the landed class who are not so

⁷ The obstructive action of the House of Lords is well exemplified in the history of Irish legislation, on the four different occasions when important Land Bills came before them.

In 1829 an Arterial Drainage Bill for Ireland was sent up from the Commons and was dropped in the Lords, though that same year they passed an Arms Act.

In 1845 the Compensation to Tenants Bill of Lord Stanley, after having passed the Commons, was vigorously opposed in the Lords, and was therefore allowed to drop.

In 1854, when Mr. Napier's four Land Bills for Ireland were sent up to the Lords, they passed the first three bills, which were in every sense landlords' bills, giving relief and powers to owners of settled estates; but they carefully rejected the only bill which was of any interest to the tenant—namely, the fourth bill, which was a 'Tenants' Compensation Bill.'

Lastly, in 1870, the Land Bill of Mr. Gladstone was shorn of some of its most important provisions through the action of the Upper Chamber.

See Barry O'Brien's *Irish Land Question*, pp. 37, 75, 101. .

utterly devoid of tactical skill. They will enlist on their side the great moderating element of the English nation, the large influential middle class, the employers of labour, the heads of mercantile enterprise; and thus, by timely concessions to the sound common-sense view of the influential portion of the electorate, the landowning classes will be saved from themselves and their own rashness. There are not wanting indications of how bitter the struggle will be—bitterer in many ways than the battle that was fought over the great Reform Bill; but when it has been fought, and when it has been won, the institutions of this country will come out stronger from the fray. The just aspirations of the people will have been gained; the land monopoly will have been broken up; the democratic element will have been disappointed by seeing institutions which, if they and the ultra-Tory element had their way, would soon be destroyed, but which, by the moderating influence of capable statesmen, and the timely concurrence of the Liberal section of the privileged class, will have received a fresh lease of existence, preserving thus the continuity of our political life, and the true interests of the English people.

BLANDFORD.

LA ROCHEFOUCAULD.

EVERYBODY has at one time or another quoted La Rochefoucauld ; some with half apology, as though the light shed by his Maxims were an evil glamour from the enemy of mankind. But no classical writer of modern times is so little known and so much the creature of hearsay. His Maxims, about which he took infinite care, have been until these latter days most shamefully treated in France ; and in England we have added to the falsification of the French text by a set of translations the most villanous that have ever been perpetrated. The result is that philosophers refute and rhetoricians rail at La Rochefoucauld without knowing much about him, and certainly without knowing what were his genuine doctrines. In London one may hunt through all the second-hand book-shops for a day without being able to procure a single English copy of the Maxims, or any passable edition of them in French ; and that tells a good deal of the oblivion into which the celebrated author has fallen, at least in this country, through the unfaithfulness of his editors and translators. Indeed, for the most part, when people quote La Rochefoucauld, it is not because they have taken the trouble to read his little book as he issued it, but because they have culled from other books, or have gathered in conversation, half a dozen sentences which cleave to the memory. The volume, as he put it forth, is not to be found in English at all, save in translations which are a travestie, and very often reverse the meaning in the most ludicrous manner. As for the fate of the work in France, it has been so singular, when we take into account the splendour of the author's reputation, that it cannot escape our inquiries ; and in truth it is only by unravelling it that we can fairly distinguish the true La Rochefoucauld from the fictitious one of common report. That unravelling is to come ; but first of all, and to give it the importance which is due to it, let us glance at the position of La Rochefoucauld, and fix a few points in his career as a writer, as a moralist, and as a man.

French literature has been summarised as follows by a master :—

Critics (he says), and especially foreigners, who in these latter days have judged our two literary centuries most severely, agree in the acknowledgment that what dominated in them, what reflected them in countless ways, what gave them

their chief ornament and glory, was the spirit of conversation and society, understanding of the world and of men, quick and fine apprehension of the seemly and of the ludicrous, exquisite delicacy of feeling, the grace, the edge, the polish to be attained in speech. And virtually *there* indeed—with reservations which will occur to everybody, and two or three names such as Bossuet and Montesquieu which we put aside—there, up to about 1789, is the distinctive character, the feature marking out French literature from among the literatures of Europe.

These are the terms in which Sainte-Beuve begins to outline his portrait of Madame de Sévigné, who must rank with the highest in any literature pervaded by the spirit of biography, of society, and of conversation. They are of equal value to indicate the position of La Rochefoucauld in the world of letters. His way was not her way, but they are both incomparable—she in letters, he in maxims. And although her letters fill a score of large volumes, while his maxims occupy little more than a hundred small pages, he has probably packed into his short sentences as much of the life and movement of his day as the lady has in her long, rambling, and ever delightful effusions. La Rochefoucauld was himself one of the greatest personages of the most splendid period of French society. He was the most brilliant talker and the most polished gentleman of his time. No one had studied more curiously than he the arts of society, the sources of conduct, the entanglements of accident, and the meshes of conversation. His maxims are the most perfect crystallisations of the thoughts and fashions and secret influences amid which he stirred. One of his short sentences conveys the outcome of an hour's voluble talk, or distils to its drop of meaning all the worth of an intrigue and all the gaiety of a season. If it be true, as Sainte-Beuve says, that up to the Revolution, French literature is to be considered in the main as the reflex of polished society, then we may say of the mirror in La Rochefoucauld's hand, it is certainly a small one, but it reflects everything. Other consummate artists may have chosen more popular forms of expression—Madame de Sévigné in letters, Molière in plays, and La Fontaine in tales of arch wit; but no one got nearer to the heart of French society than La Rochefoucauld, and no one gives more of its life-blood than he does in his book. Nor is it only of French life that he is the exponent; he had a window into the human heart, and his Maxims contain the very bones of the first man. In a word, no one, be his manner of art what it may, can be placed above La Rochefoucauld for insight into the intricacies of human motive and for the sharpness with which he reflects the to-and-fro of social life in exquisitely cut sentences. Voltaire gives him the further merit of having been the first in Europe after the revival of letters who taught people to think and to convey their thoughts in lively, precise, and delicate turns; but this is too largely expressed. It may be true of France and all the continent, but it cannot hold in the country of Francis Bacon.

To most people, however, La Rochefoucauld is repulsive, and it is impossible to set on high the man who is hateful, who is supposed to delight in blackening his kind, and who has ever been accused, although most unjustly, of assailing the bulwarks of morality. Spite of the critical commonplaces, that art is independent of ethics, and that it is possible to achieve greatness with a bad heart, there is something in the soul which rebels and refuses its homage to genius however bright when it is detestable. Therefore, to do justice to the intellectual eminence of La Rochefoucauld, we have to touch on his moral station and show how he came to occupy it; so that being in his day the man of highest breeding and sweetest courtesy, truest of the true, beloved by his friends in the most extraordinary manner, bewept at his death, says Madame de Sévigné, as man never was, and drawing from Mademoiselle d'Aunale the exclamation, 'I know nothing better than he, and I say all in that;' nevertheless, when his *Maxims* appeared they excited among many readers a horror of the man who could find so much wickedness in his heart. The fact is, that extreme doctrines, whether of the goodness or of the badness of human nature, are never the discovery of any one man, but rather belong to the atmosphere in which he lives. In France, of the seventeenth century, no fact is more obvious than this—we stumble on it at every footstep—that the excessive corruption of human nature was part of the religious teaching of the day, unmistakable in the oratory of such Jesuits as Bourdaloue, but most accentuated in the Jansenism with which La Rochefoucauld had the nearest and most abiding ties. The most popular religious author of the day was Francis de Sales—a quaint amalgam of John Lilly, George Herbert, and Jeremy Taylor. His *Introduction à la Vie dévote* corresponds to Taylor's *Holy Living and Dying*, but has much more play of fancy, breathing of the fields and flowers amid which it was composed. Read what the gentle bishop says of himself: 'Ce bon père dit que je suis une fleur, un vase de fleurs, et un phénix : je ne suis qu'un puant homme, un corbeau, un fumier.' It was the ecclesiastical style of the period.

Since then La Rochefoucauld is not to be judged by himself alone, but by the age in which he moved, let it be noted that, though one can scarcely speak of him as a religious man, he was part and parcel of a great religious movement sweeping on from century to century. We have to think of three centuries, the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth, with a great wave of thought rolling on from one to another. In the first of these the wave was at its lowest: the Church was fallen, and religion had become very cold. In the next the Church made a mighty effort to recover its strength, and France saw the religious wave cresting in two distinct points, Jesuitism and Jansenism. In the eighteenth century the moral wave sloped down again with vast intellectual force and lively spirits to uncleanness of life, to inhuman devilry, to godless liberty,

to utter want of faith except in wild men of the woods and the life of nature. And what does all this mean? It means that in the sixteenth century, when the Church was fallen, its leading doctrine was Pelagianism or semi-Pelagianism; it denied original sin; it believed in human goodness; it put out of sight the overwhelming need of supernatural grace. Let us leap the next century and glide on to the eighteenth. There we find the doctrine of human perfectibility, the discovery of savage virtue, the love of nature, and tales of the age of innocence. But between those two eras there is the seventeenth century, in which the billow has a different curve. The Church has revived; its most pronounced doctrine is the need of a Saviour; and what can be the need of one, if there is nothing to save? The fall of man therefore, the power of sin, the frightful corruption of the heart, and the danger of everlasting punishment, became the religious watchwords of the day. In England, at the same time, we know how the Puritans preached the utter worthlessness of man. 'The whole head is sick and the whole heart faint. From the sole of the foot even unto the head, there is no soundness in it, but wounds and bruises and putrefying sores; they have not been closed, neither bound up, neither mollified with ointment.' This piercing religious cry might be heard everywhere throughout France in the seventeenth century, but it was loudest and most thrilling in Port Royal, and in the penitents who flocked to its spiritual guides. La Rochefoucauld, when he planned his book of Maxims, lived in the midst of these people, and many of his sentences were composed in the precincts of the convent of Port Royal in Paris, where his fair friend, Madame de Sablé, was leading a half-penitential life, one part in the religious house, the other in apartments of her own adjoining. There and elsewhere he had dinned into his ears: 'We have left undone those things which we ought to have done; we have done those things which we ought not to have done; and there is no health in us.' 'Oh wretched man that I am! who will deliver me from this body of sin and death?' What wonder that he should give his own experience as a man of the world to the current religious creed? His Maxims were an echo from palace walls of the searchings of heart, and the murmurs of confession heard in dim recesses of the cloister. It was not he alone who indulged in such maxims. There are people who can play at religion and make themselves buxom in a shroud. What the penitent sighed to his Redeemer the courtier twisted into epigrams. The wail of the broken-hearted sinner became the wit of the Academy; and the shriek of the lost soul added dimples to the beauty of the *Précieuse* in the blue-room of the Hôtel de Rambouillet.

La Rochefoucauld was too sincere a man to indulge in such levities. Any one can see that, be his Maxims what they may, he is serious in them, and even stern. Their great defect, and that which separates them from the beliefs of the orthodox, is not that they are

false, but that they suggest no remedy. They preach the depravity of the human race; they say not a word of salvation, or at least give no hint of a Saviour. The world on the whole is Pelagian, and believes in the excellence of human nature. So strong is this tendency that one scarcely knows how it fell to the lot of a poor Welshman of the name of Morgan to go to Rome, to have his name translated into Pelagius, and to bestow it henceforth for ever on the self-complacency of mankind in its own virtues. There must be an amazing fund of self-satisfaction in the Celtic nature which could thus stamp itself permanently in the nomenclature of Christendom. It is because the world is in the main Pelagian that La Rochefoucauld was hard hit as a slanderer of humanity and as almost the incarnation of Diabolos. The world might denounce him; his reply was always an appeal to the Fathers of the Church. The Jansenists were wholly with him; and the Jesuit Father Rapin put him in the way of proving his doctrines from writings of the Saints. Now, as then, we have still to ask the doctors of the Church and her obedient children which they prefer, the pleasant creed of Pelagius, with a Saviour for whom there is no necessity, or La Rochefoucauld's rough doctrine of a corrupt world in which the corruption is acknowledged, though not the cure? Not less have we to ask the admiring disciples of that ancient Briton, Morgan or Pelagius, why is La Rochefoucauld to be branded as a misanthrope for doctrines which (details apart and the errors of false editions excepted) were in their gist received as praiseworthy from the lips of Bossuet and Fénelon, and from the pens of Arnauld and Pascal? It may be that we are detracting from his originality when insisting that it is not he who first discovered the corruptions of the heart. Not much originality can be claimed for any one in that respect. His great feat is to have secularised the doctrine, to have attired it in the phrases of the world, and to have applied it with rare fineness of observation, with ingenious disclosures of detail, and with the most incisive wit, to the daily traffic of society.

How La Rochefoucauld has been caricatured by being identified personally with a particular selection of his *Maxims*, those that say the worst for human nature, may be shown by the parallel process of selecting another set of *Maxims* and taking them for a sketch of his portrait. In the common idea, he is a monster raised upon the pedestal of Voltaire's utterly false but universally accepted remark that there is scarcely more than one truth in the book of *Maxims*, that self-love is at the root of all. Having looked on that picture, let us try to imagine another from the following confessions and rules of life.

31. Had we no faults of our own, we should not take so much pleasure to note them in others.

411. We have but few faults which are not more excusable than the means we employ to hide them.

202. Those are mock gentlefolk who mask their faults to others and to themselves: the true know them perfectly and acknowledge them.

206. To be truly a gentleman one should be willing at all times to be exposed to the scrutiny of gentlefolk.

203. The true gentleman is one who vaunts himself upon nothing.

358. Humility is the true badge of the Christian virtues; without it we hug our faults, and they are only overgrown with pride, which conceals them from others and oftentimes from ourselves.

537. Humility is the altar on which God wills that we should offer him sacrifices.

534. Crowds of people would be godly, but no one cares to be humble.

102. The mind is ever the dupe of the heart.

70. There is no disguise which can long conceal love where it is, or feign it where it is not.

259. The pleasure of love is in loving, and we are happier in the passion which we feel than in that which we inspire.

202. There is no passion in which self-love reigns so powerfully as in love, and one is always more inclined to sacrifice the repose of the person loved than to part with one's own.

525. The power possessed over us by those we love is nearly always greater than that which we possess over ourselves.

544. A true friend is the greatest of all blessings and that which we least of all dream of securing.

561. A man who loves nobody is more unhappy than one whom nobody loves.

434. When our friends have deceived us we owe nothing save indifference to the marks of their friendship, but we always owe sensibility to their misfortunes.

84. It is more shameful to distrust one's friends than to be deceived by them.

395. We are sometimes less unhappy in being deceived about one we love than in being undeceived.

496. Quarrels would be shortlived if the wrong were only on one side.

235. We console ourselves easily for the misfortunes of our friends when they serve to signalise our affection for them.

433. The surest sign of being born with great qualities is to be born without envy.

218. Hypocrisy is a homage which vice pays to virtue.

447. Seemliness is the least of all the laws and the most observed.

510. To punish man for his original sin God has permitted him to make a god of his self-conceit, and to be tormented by it in every act of his life.

512. We dread all things as mortals and we desire all things as if we were immortal.

Add to these Maxims the extraordinary circumstance that, with all his insinuating address and courtly bearing, La Rochefoucauld was one of the most bashful of men, and we may construct from them a portrait of him which, although not complete, must be more so than the commonly received one made up of other maxims of the selfish type indicated by Voltaire. It must also be a nearer likeness, for the fact is that he disowned the more odious of those sayings which have gone to form his caricature and to fill the mind with horror at the hardness of his heart.

This brings us to the history of his book, which will show that he is best known by Maxims which he suppressed a year after they were published.

La Rochefoucauld published five editions of his *Maxims*, the first in 1665, the others in 1666, 1671, 1675, and 1678. The last is the authoritative one, having received his finishing touches and his ripest observations; but, as often happens, he is best known by his first appearance. Now the difference between the last edition and the first consists not merely in advancing mellowness of thought and fitness of expression, but in two things besides—that the author added many new maxims and that he struck out old ones. With regard to his additions they have an interest of their own, although in the present connection it is enough to say that, starting in his earliest issue with 318 maxims, he added in successive ones until finally he reached the number of 504. But the important fact to be noticed is that he suppressed seventy-nine of his maxims, and that no less than seventy-five belonged to his first edition. The grand *auto-da-fé* took place before publication of his second edition. He then put into the fire sixty-four maxims; the remaining eleven being sacrificed from time to time later on. The sixty-four maxims thus immolated the year after they were published included some of La Rochefoucauld's best known utterances. For example, the very elaborate one on self-love which appeared at the head of his first edition, and on the strength of which mainly he is regarded as the champion of the selfish theory of morals, was quashed, and never again in his lifetime permitted to see the light. It was the same with that other famous maxim on the misfortunes of our best friends. Such facts are of the utmost importance to our estimate of La Rochefoucauld, who has been seriously misrepresented through editors, after his death, replacing the suppressed maxims in his text, and in prominent positions there, instead of keeping them in a class apart. The consequence has been that our Shaftesburys, our Bishop Butlers, and other philosophers, have attacked for his unsoundness not so much the author of the 504 acknowledged maxims, as the author of the sixty-four disowned ones. It is not to be denied that in the acknowledged maxims traces are to be found of the selfish theory; but they would scarcely have been noticed were it not for the importance they derive from the reflected light of the doctrines which La Rochefoucauld abjured. And the reintroduction therefore of the discarded maxims into the text is not merely in itself a falsification of the author's views, it throws a false glare upon the maxims which he allowed to remain. Any one who will carefully read the long maxim on self-love cannot fail to see what a masterpiece of writing it is, what a prodigious labour of love La Rochefoucauld bestowed upon it, and how reluctant he must have been to suppress it. Only some overpowering reason could have impelled him to the sacrifice. So much the greater is the wrong which has been done to his memory in the undoing of his deliberate intention.

He died in 1680, and thirteen years afterwards friends, who must

have had access to his papers, published a new edition of his *Maxims*. They did their work badly. In the first place, they prefixed to the edition fifty maxims, all seemingly new, although upon examination it will be found that only twenty-eight are new, while the rest are but repetitions of those in the recognised collection. It is odd that this misreckoning was not detected by any Frenchman for 160 years. From the date of their first publication in 1693 until Duplessis published his charming Elzevirian edition in 1853, these fifty maxims have been printed by a long succession of French editors as if they were all posthumous. But there is a worse fault in the edition of 1693. Those friends of La Rochefoucauld who knew so little of his book that they published the fifty maxims as if all were new to the world, took it upon themselves to disinter the chief maxim, that on self-love, which had been slain and buried by the author, and to install it in the foremost place at the head of the maxims and immediately after the title-page. Probably they were well-meaning, however weak. They saw the perfection of the writing in this, the most eloquent, the most polished, and the most vehement of all La Rochefoucauld's maxims; they could not understand why he put his foot upon it; and thinking more of the form than of the substance, they determined to revive it. Here was the entrance of evil and the beginning of confusion. In the next important edition of the *Maxims*, that of Amelot de la Houssaye, published in 1714, we have the whole of the suppressed maxims brought back into the text and intermingled, nobody knows how, with the sentences to which La Rochefoucauld gave his sanction. The process of corruption and misrepresentation went on until, towards the middle of the century, the Abbé De la Roche prepared an edition of the *Maxims* in which they were frankly mixed up with the *Christian Maxims* of Madame de la Sablière, and hers were confounded with those of La Rochefoucauld's great friend, Madame de Sablé, and with those of Abbé d'Ailly, Madame de Sablé's confessor. Imagine the masculine sense of the great French classic herding with anything so sickly and silly as this, which is contradictory in its very terms. 'In intercourse the most innocent between persons of different sex, there is always a kind of spiritual sensuality which weakens virtue if it does not destroy it altogether.' Such nauseous nonsense had before then, it is true, been published in conjunction with La Rochefoucauld's *Maxims*, but it had been printed apart in a section by itself. The Abbé de la Roche now mixed all up and confused them in a new arrangement—a sort of alphabetical one, in which sentences on the same subject were docketed together with the addition of footnotes, part of his own device, part borrowed from Amelot de la Houssaye. This is the worst of all the editions of La Rochefoucauld, because, as we shall presently see, the model upon which (with corrections and

retrenchments) was formed the only English edition of the *Maxims* which has still a place in our book-market.

There was no sign of improvement, nothing but changes in the mode of adulteration, until the eve of the French Revolution, when the Abbé Brotier found extreme difficulty in procuring a single genuine copy of La Rochefoucauld's work. He was so astounded at this discovery and so much interested in the work itself that he made many researches in public and private libraries—the outcome being an edition of the *Maxims* (bearing date 1789) the most perfect that had appeared since the decease of their author. He provided a trustworthy and rightly numbered text of the *Maxims* as left with the author's last touches in his last edition; as for the suppressed *Maxims*, he kept them by themselves under the name of *Premières Pensées*; and he added notes, full of curious information, which has never been disputed, although presented on his own sole voucher without reference to authorities. The Abbé Brotier, however, committed mistakes. He reckoned the number of the First Thoughts at 121, which of course included more than were suppressed; and he took no account of the posthumous *Maxims*. Moreover, in 1731 there had been published anonymously seven essays, which were attributed to La Rochefoucauld, which have since been proved to have really come from his pen, and which have embedded in them a number of his acknowledged *Maxims*. The accomplished Abbé thought he could carve these essays into a supplementary series of *Maxims*, instead of being faithful to his trust in giving the author's text precisely as he left it. Whether for this reason or for any other, such as the recoil of a nation, wild with dreams of a millennium at hand, from any depressing view of man, glorious, original man, the edition of Abbé Brotier does not seem to have made much way in France; and we have to pass on to the year 1822, when that of Aimé Martin came out with a flourish of trumpets. The date is supposed to mark an era in the history of the *Maxims*, as though, then for the first time, they were presented to the public pure of text. It is a mistake. Aimé Martin was a roaring, raving ranter, but he had not a spark of the critic in him. One stares at him with wonder as, with loud professions of religion, he goes bellowing against La Rochefoucauld through hundreds of pages. It seems as if he expected to go down to posterity with the Duke—bane and antidote. But what right had he to speak until he had first proved his mastery of the *Maxims*? He is one of those editors who did not know that a score of La Rochefoucauld's posthumous maxims were, as we have seen, published in his lifetime. Moreover, his terrific bellowing is a proof that, though mechanically in his pages the suppressed maxims were fenced off from the authorised ones, they were in his mind inseparably intermixed. No, indeed; after the conscientious work done by

the Abbé Brotier in the most unpretending manner towards the establishment of La Rochefoucauld's text, we are not going to exalt Aimé Martin because he inherited his predecessor's labours and slightly improved upon them.

It was not until 1853 that a critical edition of the *Maxims* appeared which was entitled to precedence over that of Brotier. This was the beautiful little Elzevir edition of Duplessis, the same who discovered for the first time in France that the fifty maxims announced as posthumous were not all such. Some strange errors have crept into the volume; but the text fairly represented La Rochefoucauld; the annotations, full of pith and point, are of curious felicity; and the whole work is so fine and so good that it will never be quite superseded, although since its issue our knowledge of its subject has been greatly extended. But mark the date of it—1853; as likewise that of the Abbé Brotier's performance—1789. From the date of La Rochefoucauld's last edition—1678—France had to wait 111 years before she ever again saw an edition of the *Maxims* as the author left them. She had to wait 175 years before she had a good critical edition of the *Maxims* with an absolutely correct rendering of the suppressed ones and of posthumous discoveries.

It is remarkable that all this time no one had thought of prying into La Rochefoucauld's MSS. at the Château of Rochemorvan. In 1863 M. Barthélemy was allowed to make the inquisition, and, among other treasures which need not occupy our attention at present, he discovered, in the handwriting of the author himself, a copy of the *Maxims* as at first projected. The collection contains 259 maxims, and may be described as a preliminary or sketch edition. Here is his little book as he first wrote it and put it together. It is really his first edition, although it did not see the day until 198 years after the volume actually known as such was published. It is a most interesting MS., both as containing a few maxims previously unknown, and as enabling us to see how the author advanced in his composition from good to better and best. In these respects the French editors do it every justice; but they have failed to perceive wherein its chief value consists. It consists in proving that La Rochefoucauld's keynote was in his first thought what it was in his last; and that when in his first *published* edition he struck another keynote (that by which all the world knows him) he silenced it immediately, because it was false. The keynote of all that he has written is the necessity of truthfulness, the immanence of deceit, the ambiguity of appearance, the want of reality in human life. Then the frontispiece of his book as finally authorised is an emblem of his meaning throughout: it is the picture of a boy-love, named Love of Truth, plucking a fair mask from an ugly face, which is none other than the bust of that great professor—Seneca. Thus also the motto to his *Maxims*, placed at their head, and containing

their essence, is a statement that 'our virtues are very often but vices in disguise.' The first of the maxims after this contains the statement that 'it is not always from valour and from chastity that men are valiant and women chaste.' Now these two maxims placed in the forefront of La Rochefoucauld's book, and giving its leading idea, are the two maxims which also stand first in his MS. edition, and give the leading idea there also. He is thus consistent with himself in his earliest and in his later editions. But in 1665 he proposed to give the world a first edition, and in a moment of aberration he changed all. He knocked aside the two leading maxims about truthfulness of conduct; and he gave the places of honour to four maxims on selfishness of conduct, the first being the most elaborate of all his compositions—the long account of self-love. It is impossible to read these four maxims on self in such a collocation without supposing that this is the string on which he means to harp, and without regarding him as the great expositor of the selfish theory of morals. Some temporary bitterness must have got possession of him; for whereas in his MS. volume he simply said: 'The ruin of a neighbour pleases friends and enemies,' he intensified this in his first edition to the fierce declaration: 'In the adversity of our best friends we always find something which is not displeasing to us.' We have seen that the aberration did not last long, since in the following year he made a massacre of sixty-four maxims contained in this edition. The discovery of La Rochefoucauld's MS. proves that in doing so he was not entering upon a new path, but only falling back upon his original intention with clearer views and more settled purpose.

Little more need be said upon this point beyond the expression of some disappointment at the delays of French editors. After the discovery of La Rochefoucauld's MSS., several editions of the Maxims were announced, but the only one which has appeared is that edited by the late M. Gilbert in the collection of *Les Grands Ecrivains de la France*, published under the direction of M. Regnier. His work has been admirably done, but it is still, after ten years, unfinished, for he died during the siege of Paris. He left his work incomplete in a double sense, for it was to include the editing of all La Rochefoucauld's writings in three volumes. He published but one volume, containing the author's moral writings, and even this is still deficient in the sheets which are to supply biography, bibliography, and lexicography. His successor, M. Gourdault, published, in 1874, a second volume allotted to the author's memoirs; and we are told that we have still to wait for the third volume before the first, devoted to the Maxims, can be rendered complete by the delivery of the missing sheets.

The book of Maxims fared so badly in France that it is difficult to imagine a lower deep for them in England. In the course of two centuries they have been translated nine times, and, if we put one of the versions, and that an obsolete one, aside, not indeed as good or

free from the gravest errors, but as not positively disgraceful, it may be said of the others that their failure is outrageous, going far beyond all permissible bounds of error. It is not for mere failure of style, the lack of terseness, dulness of edge, or coarseness of colour, that they are to be condemned; but for downright perversion of meaning. To the iniquities of the French editors the English translators added the bewildering eccentricity of not understanding French. It would seem as if they thought that La Rochefoucauld could be translated offhand like ordinary authors, with a mere inkling of his language. When Miall undertook to translate the *Provincial Letters* of Pascal into Latin, he went into a course of training for it; and the training was to read Terence over with the utmost care, translating him into French, putting the French back into the proper Latin, and so to steep his mind in the phraseology of the great comic writer. He thus produced a first-rate Latin version of the *Letters*. To translate La Rochefoucauld into one's mother-tongue may not demand the same kind or the same amount of previous gymnastics; but assuredly it is by no means so easy a task as it has been deemed, and it is not to be done, as our translators have attempted it, with a flying pen, and with an ignorance of French of the seventeenth century.

The evil fate that pursued La Rochefoucauld's Maxims first declared itself in England. In 1685, before any of his countrymen could do him harm, he had the ill-luck to be introduced to English readers under the fostering wing of the most odious woman that ever took up a pen, Mrs. Aphra Behn. If one of her sex was more likely to be spurned than another by La Rochefoucauld and all his set, it was she, with her vulgar manners, her lewd life, and her impudent speech. The license of the French Court in those days will not bear a very close investigation, though still there are writers of mark in France who hymn the praises of La Rochefoucauld and Madame de la Fayette for their mutual tenderness, for their faithfulness to each other, for the unflinching devotion with which in advancing years they went down the hill of life linked arm in arm. These tokens of deep and enduring attachment drew the admiring gaze of their contemporaries and surrounded them with the best society in Paris, including women of unsullied purity, such as Madame de Sévigné, who was indeed the most intimate friend of Madame de la Fayette. It may be absurd to set up for a pattern the standard of life as conceived by Madame de la Fayette, who, on the retirement of Madame de Rambouillet, became the leader of Parisian tastes and fashions, and who afterwards, when La Rochefoucauld was dead, lived to repent with tears of what her world had so much praised; but, at the least, we need not misrepresent it; and it is violently misrepresented in a phrase, common at the time and still common among historians, which gave the name of French

manners to the gross immoralities of Charles the Second's reign, as though these were a weak imitation of something far worse beyond the Channel in the strongholds of Papistry and Jesuitism. The reverse was the fact. It was enough to make La Rochefoucauld writhe in his tomb to know that his Maxims were to keep company in a Miscellany with the lusts and ribaldries of Aphra Behn, and that he was to make his first appearance in England side by side with her and the obscene jesters of her crew. The translation, which appeared in the Miscellany, bore the title of 'Seneca Unmasked,' in allusion to the frontispiece of the French edition, and the author was announced as the Duke of Rushfoucave. Mrs. Behn presented English readers with but three-fourths of the maxims; she floundered about piteously in the rendering of them, and she thought to enliven some of them by bedecking them with her impudence and addressing them to her Lysander—an insult to a man who, in the portrait which he drew of himself, and which all the world might read while yet he lived, could boast that never in the presence of women had he uttered a syllable which could give them pain. As for her pleasantries, they must pass without citation. And for her mistakes here is a single specimen. 'Coquetry,' said La Rochefoucauld, 'is the basis of character in women.' Mrs. Aphra Behn made him say, 'To be a cocket or talkative is the humour most natural to women.'

In 1694 appeared a new and anonymous translation which, although not good, was yet preferable to that of Aphra Behn. It was made, however, not from the complete edition of La Rochefoucauld's Maxims, but from the fourth, containing but 413 sentences, to which was added an appendix of 152 more, borrowed from other sources. What is most remarkable, however, about the collection is that although La Rochefoucauld's name stands upon the title-page as claiming possession of the whole, only half of it is his. The small volume is divided into four parts, of which two alone belong to the author announced. The other two are allotted to the maxims of Madame de Sablé and to those of her father confessor, the Abbé d'Ailly, who published both hers and his own together a few months after she died. These last two parts are interesting, because apparently it has not hitherto been known that the maxims of Madame de Sablé and of the Abbé d'Ailly have been rendered into English. The entire book was accepted for what it professed to be—a collection of La Rochefoucauld's Maxims, and of none but his. Twelve years afterwards, namely in 1706, a second edition of this translation was issued, with more maxims of La Rochefoucauld, and with the 'Christian Maxims' of Madame de la Sablière—all on the title-page attributed to one and the same author.

In the same year came forth also two editions of a new version. One of these editions gives no hint whatsoever of the translator's name; but the other appears at the end of a volume which is chiefly

taken up with translations of Esprit's *Discourses on the Deceitfulness of Humane Virtues*. These are said to be 'done out of French by William Beauvoir, A.M., and chaplain to his Grace, James, Duke of Ormond, to which is added the Duke de la Rochefoucauld's moral reflections.' It is not quite clear from this that Beauvoir translated La Rochefoucauld as well as his great friend Esprit, but there is something in the style which makes it probable; and if so it is odd that he should attach his name to the one book and not to the other. One might infer from it that after the ill-fame attaching to the Maxims from their appearance in Mrs. Behn's noisome Miscellany, a parson was afraid to put his name to them. Whoever did the work it was well done in some respects. It gave the Maxims precisely as they stand in La Rochefoucauld's final edition. It is true that it revived the remarkable piece on Self-love, but this was placed in an appendix at the end. And as for the fifty posthumous maxims, the translator pointed out, what no Frenchman had then discovered, that only twenty-nine of them could be accepted as such. With all its merits, however, this version failed of success, and soon became obsolete, partly through the translator importing into its phraseology that fashionable slang which is supposed to be lively, but is in truth deadly, and partly through a long-windedness which would seem to fix the authorship upon Beauvoir, and, although allowed in the pulpit, is not to be endured as an imitation of La Rochefoucauld. Here is his translation of one of the maxims with his verbiage in brackets:—
 'Tis not always from [a principle of] valour that men are valiant, or from [a principle of] chastity that women are chaste.'

With French examples before them, however, it was not possible for English translators to keep to the right path indicated by the foregoing version, the only one we have had which did not seriously misrepresent La Rochefoucauld. In 1749 appeared an English version founded on the most unjustifiable of all the editions of the Maxims, that of the Abbé de la Roche. In 1775 there came forth what may fairly be called a new translation on the same model, especially if we take it as improved in successive editions which appeared in 1781, 1791, 1795, and quite recently from the publishing house of John Camden Hotten, with his successors, Messrs. Chatto and Windus. By reason of continual alterations from fresh hands, these versions, in a comparison of the first with the last, claimed to be two different translations; but it may suffice if we limit our attention to the edition published in the Golden Library of Messrs. Chatto and Windus—the only version of La Rochefoucauld which circulates in England. It consists of 507 maxims (really 506, for one is given twice over) made up of some that are authorised, some that were suppressed, and some that are posthumous, *together with two of Madame de Sablé's maxims*, all arranged in a supposed alphabetical order. 'La politesse de l'esprit,' says La Rochefoucauld, 'consiste à

penser des choses honnêtes et délicates.' 'Politeness of mind,' we are told in this odd translation, 'consists in a courteous and delicate conception,' whatever that may mean; and if we wish to look for the maxim again we must tie a knot on our handkerchief and try not to forget that it is to be found under the catchword of *Understanding*. The collection of maxims thus arbitrarily chosen and arbitrarily arrayed is badly translated. In the first place it affects curtness, as if that were the style of La Rochefoucauld, and the same thing as terseness. Besides this, it is full of blunders and always rough. La Rochefoucauld has much to say of *paresse* —which in his time and in his hands had the force of its original, *pigritia*—sloth. The translator gives it the modern sense of *illness*, incapable of seeing that the maxims in which the word occurs are nought unless it means the *cause* of idleness. At times he reverses the sense. Thus La Rochefoucauld says (No. 382) that 'Our actions are like rhyme-endings (the game of *bouts-rimés*) which each of us tags together by what lines we please.' The rhymes are fixed; the game is to supply the best lines leading up to them. The translator says that 'our actions are like the terminations of verses which we rhyme as we please,' the very thing we are not to do. Dozens of examples such as these might be given, and dozens more of examples of roughness of treatment—the translator rendering a sentence void by not attending to small qualifying words and shades of meaning. Here is an example of his rough hard touch. We all know the maxim already quoted—'In the *adversity* of our best friends we always find something which is not displeasing to us.' It is a grievous error to place such a maxim in the text among those sanctioned by La Rochefoucauld; but being there it should be given exactly. La Rochefoucauld said *adversity*, his translator makes him say *distress*; failing to perceive that so far from being identical, the one may exist without the other, or, in like manner, prosperity without enjoyment.

Passing over a doleful metrical translation of the Maxims which appeared in 1795, we come to the seventh version, which made its appearance in 1839, and had the merit of giving the text of La Rochefoucauld with as much accuracy as the French editors had then reached. It was a pretty little edition, almost intended for the waistcoat pocket, and it was issued with only the publisher's name—J. W. Southgate, Library, 164 Strand. The translation, however, is bad both in form and substance. In form it errs in a want of simplicity, and brevity arising from an attempt to get rid of what the translator calls 'the quaintness of style peculiar to the age in which the Maxims were written.' In substance, its errors are most ingenious in the art of finding out some nonsense to palm off upon La Rochefoucauld. One example at least must be given, because it is typical of the treatment which the great moralist has received. The translator, though he announces the leading maxim on self-love as suppressed, and presents it as such in a supplement with the other sup-

pressed sayings, seems not to have realised what this means, and to have held stubbornly to the vulgar opinion that the fundamental truth of the maxims is an assertion of the universal dominion of self-love. With this idea in his mind he comes to Maxim 71: 'There are few people who are not ashamed of having been in love when they cease to love each other,' and he renders it as follows:—'Most persons are ashamed of self-love when its fits are passed.' Perhaps the reader might like to look at the original, and here it is: 'Il n'y a guère de gens qui ne soient honteux de s'être aimés quand ils ne s'aiment plus.'

So determined were Englishmen not to understand the meaning of the word 'suppressed' as applicable to the maxims of La Rochefoucauld, that in 1850 Messrs. Longman published what professed to be a new translation. So it was, but it was based on the Southgate translation, correcting the more absurd of its trespasses; and yet with this same version before his eyes, the translator deliberately took all the suppressed maxims he could find, including those on self-love and the adversity of friends, and mixed them up again confusedly with the true text, planting the great maxim on self-love in its old place at the head of all. He was not going to let La Rochefoucauld know his own mind and choose his own ground. The translation itself is fairly though not finely done; and it is not free from considerable errors. Thus we have 'l'air bourgeois' rendered 'rusticity;' and, in common with all other versions, 'l'honnête homme,' the phrase which in the seventeenth century replaced the 'gentilhomme' of Montaigne, is mistranslated into 'the honest man,' unless when the translator encounters a maxim like the following (No. 353):—'A gentleman may be enamoured like a lunatic, but not like a fool,'—where it is suddenly revealed to him that 'l'honnête homme' is not an honest man, but a man of sense. Let us take another word—*amour propre*—which illustrates what we have had to see from so many points of view, how editors and translators fetter La Rochefoucauld to the one idea of self-love, and will not let him escape from it. This word has three distinct meanings—(1) self-love; (2) in a good sense, self-respect; and (3), in a disparaging sense, the mixture of pride and vanity known as conceit or self-conceit. The second is the favourite meaning of the word in modern times, but La Rochefoucauld eschews it, and his translators imagine that he employs the word in the first sense alone. It is impossible for such a man to think of anything but self-love when he mentions *amour propre*. Here is an example—No. 261—'L'éducation que l'on donne d'ordinaire aux jeunes gens est un second *amour propre* qu'on leur inspire.' This is always translated as though it referred to self-love; but if the true meaning be not at once clear, it will be found in La Rochefoucauld's MS., where the word as first written was *orgueil*, while the last and best of the French editors has shown how he

understands the passage by placing it in his index under the head of Vanity. To foist the name of self-love into this and other such maxims is not merely to make a mistake in these particular sentences, but also, by inserting the notion of self-love in passages where La Rochefoucauld never thought of it, to make it seem more prevalent in his doctrine than it really was.

The last of the translations appeared in 1871, the joint work of Messrs. Hain Friswell and I. Willis Bond, in a collection of small volumes known as the Bayard Series. It gives one a fair idea of what Dryden had in his mind when he poured the torrent of his wrath upon Shadwell :—

The rest to some faint meaning make pretence,
But Shadwell never deviates into sense.

There is scarcely a page of this work which is not disfigured by some incredible blunder of translation, of history, of logic, or of typography. It would do the book too much honour to give examples, and it must be enough to say that it has the distinction of running a close race with the worst translation of any author that ever was produced.

Ill as we have to speak of the English versions of La Rochefoucauld, there is something to be said in extenuation of their errors, since the French themselves are often strangely at fault in their attempts to catch, not the meaning, but the manner of this great writer. Let us take Sainte-Beuve for an example, a critic so clear-sighted, that whether it were or were not in his power to draw the bow of La Rochefoucauld, at least one might expect him to know for certain whether he had succeeded or failed. Now let us turn to his portrait of the Duke published capriciously among his *Portraits de Femmes*. At the end he presented his readers with fifty of his own maxims. Much acquaintance with the author, he said, had made maxim-making contagious; and these fifty which he offered would be found 'more or less analogous in form or in spirit' to those of La Rochefoucauld; even if they failed they were at least a tribute of homage to the great master. It is astonishing to see what a great gulf there is between the maxims of the two writers, and how incapable Sainte-Beuve was of seeing it. His maxims are egotistical, effusive, meant for startling effect rather than for unadorned truth, built upon metaphor, tackled with explanations apt to be wordy, and wanting in finish. Sainte-Beuve seldom gave out his meaning in one irremovable word. In the commencement of this essay there is a sentence of his, descriptive of French literature, which is in his most characteristic manner. He throws out a happy phrase, but it is insufficient; he tries again, and that too is not quite right; but by one phrase that falls short, another that goes too far, and others which are beside the mark, he achieves his thought, as he would say, and indicates clearly enough what he would be at. His maxims are really formed

upon the model of Joubert's, and they have little or no resemblance to those of La Rochefoucauld.

The style of this extraordinary man belongs to the rarities of art, and is almost a mystery, for none was ever so strong of grasp and fine of point, while yet so plain and effortless. We know, indeed, the strength of it, how much it tells and how far it carries; but we little think of its amazing simplicity and even barrenness of means. If it is to be matched at all in its nakedness, we must look not to any modern language for its like, but to that of Athens. It makes the nearest approach to the Attic manner which a Frenchman ever attained, and this one was ignorant of Greek. A large word indeed is Atticism, including many positive excellencies, and chief of all the most expressive and flexible dialect of a speech that has never been surpassed. Furthermore, if we had to describe Atticism truly, we should have to allow that in the Athenian nature there was an oratorical element that tended to showiness and is very much put out of sight when in modern times we refer to the Attic manner. It is impossible to praise a mere negation, and yet it is a kind of negation that we have in our minds chiefly when we try to define the most marked sign of Atticism—call it as we may—severity, simplicity, modesty, temperance, quietness, its opposition to the loaded style known in different degrees as Rhodian and Asiatic. Many people imagine that they have the Attic salt because they have abundance of wit: they are unaware that its prime quality is to produce a flavour without suggesting the salt; so that many a modern when he reads the Greek anthology (which, by the way, is not exclusively Attic, and might therefore be adduced to prove that the literary quality we are regarding was not exclusively Attic) lifts his eyebrows and declares that this epigram is pointless, and that inscription has nothing in it. Now in the style of La Rochefoucauld what impresses one even more than its fineness of turn, conciseness, and precision, is its Attic avoidance of surprising effect, its trust in common expressions, its absence of glitter, may I say its *mate* colour? Attempt at shining, use of strong words, show of any kind is effectually suppressed in it, and we have before us in 600 short sentences the last triumph of style—to efface itself.

What first catches the eye in it is the iteration of word and phrase. This, however, is a peculiarity which belongs not to La Rochefoucauld alone, but also to the best French of the period. 'A critic I am fond of quoting,' says Sainte-Beuve, but without mentioning his name, 'has said,—It is very remarkable to see how much under Louis XIV. the French language in all its purity and as it was written by Madame de la Fayette, Madame de Sévigné, M. de la Rochefoucauld, was composed of a small number of words which recur unceasingly in discourse with a sort of charm.' This is marked in all La Rochefoucauld's writings, but doubly so in his *Maxims*, from the fewness of the sen-

tences and the selectness of the vocabulary. It is convenient too in the *Maxims*, when the terms are in a manner titles indicating the subjects of the several sayings, to have one name instead of many by which to trace the theme, be it bravery, indolence, or fortune, through the various sentences. But the sameness and paucity of La Rochefoucauld's vocabulary go beyond this. He is never afraid of flat phrases and bald words, nor does it occur to him that repetition of expressions deadens the sense while variety quickens it. His adjectives come like a few coins—shillings, and sixpences and sovereigns—with which one can count up millions. *Good* and *bad*, *much* and *little*, *true* and *false*, *difficult* and *easy*—there is the mintage of his realm, and if he were expected to say *slight* or *slender* for *little*, or to ring changes on the synonyms for *good* and *bad*, he would feel no richer than an English traveller who has all the coins of Europe intermingled with his pounds, shillings, and pence. The effect of the style will be felt if we string together a few of the scattered maxims to show the stereotyped phrase. Let us take the verb to *hide*, which is one of his favourites; sometimes he employs *disguise* instead; but one or other he is almost sure to introduce where, for the sake of variety, more modern writers would, at least in English, be trying *cloak*, *mask*, *veil*, *conceal*, *screen*, *veneer*, and ever so many more. In the following set of maxims, which might be greatly extended, it has not been deemed necessary to give all the sentences in full.

69. If there is a pure love, it is *hidden* at the bottom of the heart and unknown.

70. There is no disguise which can *hide* love long.

245. It shows great cleverness to be able to *hide* one's cleverness.

257. Gravity is a mystery which the body makes to *hide* defects of the mind.

344. Most men, like plants, have *hidden* properties which chance discovers.

368. Most virtuous women are *hidden* treasures.

406. Coquettes make it a rule to be jealous of their lovers to *hide* their envy of other women.

It does not follow that he absolutely refuses variety. Thus in Maxim 20 he says, 'The steadfastness of the sage is but *the art of locking up* the tumult in his breast: ' when his first thought no doubt was to say in his own proper manner, 'the art of *hiding*.' Also when in one and the same maxim, repetition becomes too obvious, La Rochefoucauld finds no difficulty in giving variety to his phrase by finely rounded turns. Thus in No. 215, 'Il y en a qui sont braves à coups d'épée, et qui craignent les coups de mousquet; d'autres sont assurés aux coups de mousquet, et appréhendent de se battre à coups d'épée.' But even here one can see how, while he is taking pains to variegate the terms in which to describe bravery and fear, he is perfectly unconcerned at the multiplication of his *coups*.

Look next at the meekness with which La Rochefoucauld resigns himself to the precise formulas and minute articulation of the French grammar. To an English ear the chain of French speech is made up

of an excessive number of little words; particles and tiresome connecting links. An Englishman can always express himself in fewer words. The French must say *l'homme* where we say *man*; and *l'homme que vous savez* where we can say *the man you know*. In the most modern French much of the verbosity of concatenation is boldly thrown aside by means of the jotting style introduced by Pascal, as *diseur de bons mots, mauvais caractère*; but in the seventeenth century few ellipses were permitted, and one could not clear a circumlocution by a running leap. Even to this day it makes an Englishman go mincingly when he has to follow syllable by syllable the articulation of such formalities as *qu'est-ce qu'il y a* or *qu'est-ce que c'est que ça?* and it is not in the nature of our language to give anything like a reflection of their detail in translation. In the time of La Rochefoucauld this detail was even more marked, but he submitted to it without apparent resistance. He is unrivalled for terseness, and most people think of terseness as first of all implying a riddance of superfluous words. That of La Rochefoucauld is chiefly in his thought: in his phraseology there is no solution of grammatical continuity, no suppression of any the least particle. I quote from Mr. Sala the following sentence written in Paris, and reflecting the modern French idiom: 'I began to imagine that our *loge* must be on a level with the topmost tier. Error! We had not yet attained the level of the stage.' That is not only the French idiom, but is fast also becoming an English one; and it is the very opposite in spirit of seventeenth-century French and of La Rochefoucauld's manner. There is no style, however, so opposed to his as that of our most classical poet, who is above all things known for correctness. Read the *Essay on Man*. See there the extreme of an elliptical style, and Pope's impatience of the lagging gait caused by prepositions and conjunctions, pronouns and auxiliary verbs. La Rochefoucauld could not have written the line—'Man never is, but always to be, blest.' In his diction it would be, Man is never blest, but he is ever about to be blest. Here is one of La Rochefoucauld's own sentences, rendered three times, to show the ordinary English form, the ordinary French form, and his own ordinary form, the articulation being more minute as we pass from the one to the other in the order indicated:—

English form:—Wit should have variety; those who have but one sort cannot please long.

French form:—Wit should have variety; those who have but one sort of it (*en*) cannot please long.

La Rochefoucauld's form:—Wit should have variety; those who have but one sort of wit cannot please long.

In the original it runs thus: 'Il faut de la variété dans l'esprit; ceux qui n'ont que d'une sorte d'esprit ne peuvent pas plaire longtemps.' And here we light upon one of the tokens of La Rochefoucauld's manner, which no doubt led Voltaire to extol precision as

the most marked feature of the style : though we in England perhaps might ask : Is the precision of La Rochefoucauld, as displayed in the foregoing example, in any way more unmistakable than that of the English idiom ? Is it not over-precision ?

Be that as it may, it is evident that the elaborate articulation to which La Rochefoucauld submitted in piecing together his sentences, while it conduced to their precision and stateliness, interfered with their freedom and rapidity of movement. As for the lack of freedom, La Rochefoucauld showed it in that great test—his incapacity of managing a parenthesis : with him no saving clauses, no irresistible digressions, no passing allusions, no wayside flowers. And as for the want of rapidity, read such a sentence as this (No. 533), which is taken from the posthumous maxims, but is typical : ‘On loue et on blâme la plupart des choses parce que c’est la mode de les louer ou de les blâmer.’ Note, by the way, as an example of exceeding articulation, *la plupart des choses* for the English *most things*. That, however, is not peculiar to La Rochefoucauld ; it is a bit of chain-work which he could not give up without giving up his language. His peculiar mark is to be seen in the conclusion of the sentence. In English the whole would run : ‘We praise and we blame most things because it is the fashion,’ or more accurately, ‘according to the fashion.’ La Rochefoucauld works out the logical contents of his idea to the last grain ; ‘because it is the fashion to praise them or to blame them.’ For another example turn to Maxim 393 : ‘L’air bourgeois se perd quelquefois dans l’armée, mais il ne se perd jamais à la cour.’ ‘The cockney manner sometimes wears off in the army, but [it] never [wears off] at court.’ There are dozens of other instances at hand to show how La Rochefoucauld never fretted at a round-about locution nor tried to get over it ; the conciseness at which he aimed being of thought, as already said, far more than of words. Mingling as he does the neatest curves of expression with the slow formulas of an unwieldy grammar, he reminds one of the often dull seesaw of Attic prose in which the writers, with the most perfect phrasing at command, seem not to be aware of the monotonous oscillation of their sentences on the pivots of *ὁ μὲν—ὁ δέ, τὸ μὲν—τὸ δέ, τὰ μὲν—τὰ δέ*.

Not only is La Rochefoucauld thus unpretending in his style, choosing the commonest words with quaint iteration, and following the grooves of a many-syllabled syntax with unswerving routine, as though he could not escape from the cogs of a wheel ; he is also free, in nearly every line that he has written, from any attempt at ornament or even at mere play of thought. If I seem to make an exception, it is because, in his earlier writings, the *Essays*, he sometimes liked to trace a comparison throughout all its ramifications until it assumed the importance of an allegory, and that, too, ‘as headstrong as the allegory on the banks of the Nile.’ It is difficult

to prove a negative and to show by the want of ornament that La Rochefoucauld avoided it. But he himself has in one of his maxims (No. 250) given a definition of eloquence which is a perfect description of his own practice: 'True eloquence consists in saying all that is needful and nothing more.' There will always be disputes, however, as to what is needful. The close expression which may contain a thought in its entirety, may yet be insufficient without reasons, illustrations, repetitions—a good deal of mere play—to make it clear to ordinary minds, and to give it the force of conviction. La Rochefoucauld himself was content in his most mature work to state his ideas clearly and tersely; but he left it to his readers to embroider them with fancies, and to sustain them with arguments.

His method of arriving at his maxims is interesting, and may be seen distinctly in his earlier ones. His later ones he threw out perfectly formed, and we can find little or no trace of work upon them. It is in the earlier ones that we can follow his conceptions from his first grasp of them on through successive mouldings to the final execution. He first of all projected his thought as any one else would, with the suggestions that led to it, with the reasons which seemed to justify it, and perhaps with illustrations to explain it. When ideas flash upon us, we are all more or less conscious of the thunderclouds from which they lightened, and are apt to bring all the storms of our doubts and perplexities before others, in order to show them distinctly how the electricity gathered upon us, how the two clouds came together, and where the bolt struck. It is curious to see what a number of La Rochefoucauld's earlier ideas are expressed in this way, with the accompaniment of explanations and inferences. A considerable number of his Maxims will be found interwoven with his Essays: the context is afterwards cut away, and we have then the maxim in the form he strove after, that of bare outline. Probably in the maturity of his powers, for he was never a writer of what the French call the first jet or throw, he worked in the same way, throwing his idea upon paper with preliminaries, accessories, and corollaries; but practice had taught him to suppress all this husk of outlying detail, useful to him in determining his thought, but useless to readers for its apprehension. His manner of peeling away phrase after phrase and detail after detail until he got to the kernel of his matter, demands perhaps an example: and we take the maxim on Jealousy, (No. 32), as it appeared in successive editions, until it was reduced to perfect form. It should be stated, however, that the first form given below comprises two maxims (Nos. 128 and 65) as they appear in the original MS.

First form, as in the original MS. :—Jealousy subsists only in doubts and lives only in new inquietudes. The remedy for jealousy is the certainty of what we fear, for it puts an end to life or an end to love. It is a cruel remedy, but it is milder than doubt and suspicions.

Second form, as in the first published Edition:—Jealousy subsists only in doubts; its substance is uncertainty; it is a passion which everyday seeks for new grounds of disquietude and for new torments. We cease to be jealous the moment we are enlivened as to the cause of jealousy.

Third form, as in second Edition:—Jealousy feeds on doubts. It is a passion which seeks always for new grounds of disquietude and for new torments; and it turns to fury as soon as we pass from doubt to certainty.

Fourth and final form:—Jealousy feeds on doubts, and it turns to fury or it ends as soon as we pass from doubt to certainty.

Such is the style of the man, and we should now go on to examine the substance of his writings and the nature of his ideals. This article is, however, already too long, and further elucidations must be reserved. The labour of the present paper is but a clearing of the ground, a statement of preliminaries and a demand for a new study of La Rochefoucauld.

E. S. DALLAS.

THE UNITED STATES AS A FIELD FOR AGRICULTURAL SETTLERS.

THE subject of this paper is not only a large one, but it is one on which much has been said and written already. It is also true that a most able and exhaustive report on the agricultural capacity of America has been recently issued by the commission which was appointed by the late Government to inquire into the causes of agricultural distress in this country. But I approach the subject from a somewhat different point of view. The purpose for which the assistant-commissioners were sent to America was to inquire into and report as to the probable effect of American competition on the owners and occupiers of land in this country. My object is rather to inquire what are the prospects of those who contemplate emigrating to America with a view to bettering their condition, and to point out what in my judgment are the localities best suited for intending emigrants.

I shall confine myself, as the title of this paper indicates, to the United States, not because I wish to ignore or disparage in any way the claims of Canada, but because I am not a competent witness with respect to that country. When I was last in America¹ I was not on Canadian soil at all, with the exception of a few hours which I passed on the Canadian side of Niagara Falls. As regards the great and fertile district of Manitoba I could say nothing which had not appeared already in books or newspapers. And even in respect of the United States the knowledge which I have acquired from personal observation is limited to two regions, Western Oregon and Colorado, though I have endeavoured to avail myself of the best sources of information within my reach as to other parts of the country.

Agricultural emigrants may be divided into two classes: first, those who intend to cultivate their farms by the labour of their own hands; second, persons possessed of more or less capital, or perhaps, I should rather say, a class of larger capitalists, for, as I think I shall show presently, every one who goes to the United States with the intention of owning land, ought to be possessed of a certain amount of capital.

The class of larger capitalists may be again subdivided into arable and pastoral farmers. In the more newly settled Western states this line is much more sharply drawn than it is in this country. In Illinois and the other middle states there are many persons who pursue a system of mixed husbandry, who raise grain crops and who

¹ A few months ago.

also own fine herds of cattle. But in the more newly settled states the arable farmers for the most part possess very little live stock except their horses and a few cows, while those who apply themselves to rearing cattle or sheep do very little with the plough.

As regards the agricultural labourer I doubt whether a man who has been bred to agricultural labour only, and who has not the command of some little capital, is likely to do himself much good by emigrating to the United States. Wages, no doubt, are high while there is work to be done, but there is not so much constant employment as in this country. It is very much the practice in the United States to take men on by the job and to discharge them after the work has been done. And as there is very little green crop grown in the United States, there is much less employment there for women and children than there is here. These observations are borne out by the Report of the assistant-commissioners which has lately been issued. They say:—

The farm labourer can hardly be said to exist as a distinct class in the United States, unless it be among the coloured people in the middle and Southern states. In the large farms of the west the bothy system is carried out, and buildings are put up in which the summer men mess and sleep. In winter they are off to the towns and cities, and it is seldom the same faces are seen two years running on the farm.

It should be remarked that though wages may appear high, the hours of labour from spring to autumn are long, and winter is a period of almost complete cessation from work for man and beast on the American farm. The very few labourers that are required upon a great wheat-growing farm in America during the dead winter months is surprising. In one instance we were told that only two men were kept upon 5,000 acres. When the longer days and the harder work of the American labourer, together with his being employed only when he is wanted, are taken into account, the annual cost of labour per acre is much less than the amount paid in England.

At the same time there is no doubt that an energetic active man, who can put his hand to anything, who can, for instance, take a spell at lumbering or at carpenter work when agricultural employment is scarce, is likely to do exceedingly well in the United States.

To return to the classes who are possessed of some capital. The emigrant who wishes to cultivate his farm with his own hands may either enter on the Government land which is reserved for homesteads, in which case he has nothing to pay beyond the cost of the survey, amounting only to a few pounds, or he may purchase land and pay for it by instalments spread over a term of years. In the case of the Government lands he cannot homestead more than 160 acres, but he may also pre-empt, as it is called, 160 acres more, paying for it at the rate of \$1¼ an acre if more than 20 miles from a railroad, or \$2½, or a little more than 10s. an acre, if within 20 miles. He has to pay about 1s. an acre down, and the balance at the end of five years, by which time he must have executed certain improvements. In some states he may pre-empt 640 acres of what are called desert lands, that is, lands which will not grow crops without irrigation. He must in this case

at the end of five years produce a certificate that he has irrigated the land so as to make it grow crops.

And in some states the settlers may acquire from the Government 160 acres by planting 10 acres, and producing a certificate at the end of eight years that a certain number of trees are in a healthy growing state.

It may perhaps be asked what amount of money a settler ought to have to start with. To begin at the beginning, the journey out from Liverpool, say of a man with a wife and two children, to the place where they intend to locate themselves, will cost some 45*l.*, more or less.² As to the rest I will take the estimate of Mr. Eaton, a successful farmer who owns a considerable quantity of land in Colorado. Mr. Eaton's letter, which gives the amount required in detail, and which, besides, contains a great deal of valuable information, may be found in a pamphlet entitled 'Farm Lands in Colorado,' published by the Colorado Company, of which Mr. Barclay, M.P. for Forfarshire, is chairman. Mr. Eaton calculates that a man with a wife and two children will require 326*l.* to support himself and family, and bring a farm of 80 acres, which is about as much as a man with a pair of horses can till, into cultivation. If we add 45*l.* for the cost of the journey out, we have a sum of 371*l.* as the amount which is required to support the family, and meet the necessary outgoings of the farm until the first crop has been reaped and marketed. In the case of the man who enters on a homestead we have to deduct 42*l.*, which Mr. Eaton puts down as the first instalment of the purchase money, because the homesteader has nothing to pay for the land, and we thus get 329*l.*, or say, including the cost of survey, 335*l.*, as the amount required. The man who enters on a homestead with this sum in his possession ought, if this estimate is correct, to be free from debt and able to invest the proceeds of his crop, beyond what he may require for the support of himself and his family, in any way that may seem best to him. But there are some drawbacks. In order to get a homestead a man must now go very far West. He will in all probability not be very favourably situated as regards access to markets, and consequently the prices he will obtain will be low. For the same reason he may probably have difficulty in procuring many comforts that he has come to look upon almost as necessities of life, and he may have to pay very high prices for them. In the North-western states the winters are very long, the cold is intense, and the winds are piercing. Lastly, even in the remote North-west, great part of the best lands has been taken up already. When I was returning from San Francisco to New York, I met a man who told me that he had gone into the territory of Dakotah to look for land, and that there was no good land to be had, except by purchase, within 500 miles of Bismarck, which is the furthest point to which the

² The above is about the cost of the journey to Denver; to Western Minnesota it will be somewhat less.

Northern Pacific Railroad has yet been extended, and which is some 1,200 miles north-west of Chicago. On the other hand, the emigrant who purchases can choose his own location, and the payment is generally made easy to him by being spread over a term of years.

Hitherto I have been referring to those who intend to till their farms themselves. I now come to the class who are possessed of more capital, and who would desire to obtain land in larger quantities. If the settler's capital is large enough, I think it is better to buy not less than a section, *i.e.* a square mile, or 640 acres. A smaller lot costs more to fence in proportion to its size. Land can be purchased from the railway companies to whom the Government has made grants, or from parties who have acquired land from them. In Western Oregon improved farms, that is, farms with a house and some fences on them, may be purchased at from 5*l.* to 8*l.* an acre if near a railroad. Unimproved and uncleared lands can be had at all prices down to \$2.50 an acre. The land in the valley is open prairie; on the rolling ground at the foot of the hills a good deal of it is covered with oak scrub. The cost of clearing is said to vary from \$5 to \$15 per acre. The average yield is reckoned at about 20 bushels an acre, and it is said the crop can almost always be depended upon. The whole of Western Oregon is within comparatively easy reach of Portland, whence the grain is shipped. The valley is drained by the Willamette river, which is navigable for a great part of its course; there are also two railroads, and another is in course of being constructed. Land at some little distance from the existing railroads can be purchased, I believe, for about 5*l.* an acre. The settler in Western Oregon has the great advantage of an abundant and cheap supply of timber. The sides of the mountains and the edges of the streams are covered with splendid firs, some of them 200 feet high. When I was going over the proposed line of the Oregonian railway, I came across a splendid fir tree which was being burned down by means of a live coal put into the heart of it. I asked to have it measured, and found it squared 7½ feet. They told me that there was not enough timber in the strip where this tree stood to make it worth while to put up a sawmill, and that the cheapest mode of getting the tree out of the way was to burn it.

In Eastern Oregon land may be bought of the Northern Pacific Railroad Company for \$2.60, or about 12*s.* an acre. In some seasons this land is said to be very productive, yielding as much as 40 bushels of wheat per acre, but the country is sometimes subject to droughts, water is scarce in some places, and there is a deficiency of timber. The rates to Portland are also very high, but this will probably be remedied in time by the construction of a new line of railroad, and I think there can be no doubt that those who purchase land at present prices will find their property rise considerably in value in the course of the next few years.

The only other state as to which I can speak from personal know-

ledge is Colorado. Good land can be bought there at present for about \$10, or a little over 2*l.* an acre. The right to take water for irrigation from one of the canals costs about 1*l.* an acre. Land in Colorado, from the extreme dryness of the climate, is of little use unless it is either irrigated artificially or flooded in winter by a stream. A section of good land with the necessary water rights will cost about 2,000*l.* The price may be spread over a term of years, but the rate of interest in Colorado is high, not less than 10 per cent. on farming lands, so that those who possess the requisite amount of capital will probably prefer to pay the money down. Mr. Barclay puts the cost of bringing the land into cultivation, not including interest on the purchase money, and charging contract prices for the work done, at about 2*l.* per acre for the first year, so that the whole outlay on 640 acres, including the purchase money, will be about 3,300*l.* To this estimate of Mr. Barclay's I think some other items should be added, as, for example, from 80*l.* to 100*l.* for a house and the cost of fencing, which, for 640 acres, should probably be about 200*l.* But with a capital of something less than 4,000*l.* a man ought to be able to make a very good start on a farm of 640 acres. As regards the question whether a settler had better locate himself in Oregon or in Colorado, or in one of the North-western states, perhaps I shall best answer it, so far as my opinion is worth anything, by stating what I have done myself. After having traversed the United States from New York to Puget Sound, and having obtained the best information which I could procure, I have purchased land in Colorado for a near relation of my own, who intends to go out as a settler. My reasons are, (1) the yield on irrigated land is larger than either in Western Oregon or the North-western states, (2) prices of agricultural produce are higher. Mr. Barclay and Mr. Eaton both concur in stating that after the first year 25 bushels of wheat an acre may fairly be looked for on irrigated land in Colorado. In Western Oregon the average yield is put at 20 bushels an acre. In the North-western states it is a good deal less. Sixteen bushels an acre is looked upon as a large crop in Minnesota, one of the great wheat-growing states. In Iowa it is less. In Dakotah 25 and sometimes even 28 bushels are raised, but these cases are exceptional, and are found on the monster farms, where the cultivation of wheat is brought to great perfection. From the best information I can obtain, the average production of Dakotah does not much exceed 15 or 16 bushels. Then as to prices. When I was in Portland, wheat was selling for 87 cents a bushel. In Denver the price was at one time \$1.20, and it has never, I believe, been below \$1.10 this year. When we look at the prices in the North-western states, the difference is even greater. In Western Minnesota and Dakotah 75 cents a bushel is considered a good price for wheat. Without going into elaborate calculations, I think any one who will work the figures out for himself will see that it will pay better to give \$15 an acre for land that will

grow 25 bushels, which will fetch \$1.10 a bushel, than to give \$5 an acre for land that will grow 16 bushels, with the probability that the price may fall much lower. In each case the price of the land will be paid off in about the same time, but when that has been done, the owner of the higher priced and more fertile land will be in possession of a much more remunerative property. But are the high prices of agricultural produce in Colorado likely to continue? I think so. Prices there do not depend on the European markets. There is a large local demand from the mining camps, considerably larger than the state itself can supply.

Then the quantity of land which can be profitably brought under tillage is restricted by the amount of water which can be utilised for irrigation, and in the more settled parts of the state there will soon be very few streams remaining which are available for that purpose. As regards a possible fall in price in consequence of importations from other parts of the United States, the Colorado farmer has a very considerable natural protection, by reason of the great distance over which agricultural produce has to be carried. Take the article of hay, for instance, which is in great demand. Large quantities of hay are brought into Colorado from Kansas City, a distance of over six hundred miles. The freight from Kansas City is \$10 or a little over 2*l*. a ton, which of itself is considered a very good price in most parts of the United States. Great part of Western Kansas is almost a desert on account of the want of rain and the dearth of water. And though in time freights from Kansas City may be somewhat reduced by the construction of competing lines, the distance can never be much shortened, inasmuch as the Kansas Pacific runs almost in a straight line from Kansas City to Denver.

Other articles of agricultural produce are also high in price. When I was last in Denver potatoes were selling at 8*l*. a ton, whereas we consider 4*l*. a very good price in this country. No doubt the prices both of hay and potatoes were somewhat exceptional last year, as the season had been dry and the crop therefore short. Still I understand that these articles always fetch a high price as compared with what can be obtained for them in most other parts of the United States. There are, too, great developments projected in the shape of railroads connecting with the Colorado lines, and passing through Arizona and Mexico to ports on the Pacific. I think there can be no doubt that the construction of these lines will tend to stimulate the growth of Denver and of other towns in Colorado. I believe that any one who purchases land judiciously in Colorado at the present time will not only receive a very handsome return for his investment, but that the capital value of his property will be very largely enhanced in the course of the next few years.

The climate of Colorado is dry and bracing, owing to the circumstance that even the less elevated part of the state on which the town of Denver stands is some 5,000 feet above the sea. It is never

oppressively hot. In winter the temperature is sometimes very low ; towards the end of last November the thermometer fell to 20° below Zero. But the piercing winds which in winter sweep over the prairies of Iowa and Minnesota seldom prevail in Colorado. Neither is the settler in Colorado liable to suffer from ague, a complaint which sometimes attacks the inhabitants of that part of Western Oregon which may be described as the valley of the Willamette river. Indeed, invalids from many parts of the United States now resort to Colorado in search of purer air than they can find at home. By way of illustrating the extraordinary clearness of the atmosphere a story is told of an enthusiastic tourist who started from Denver, hoping to reach the top of Pike's Peak, the highest mountain in sight, and return next day. The base of the mountain is more than seventy-five miles from Denver, and the summit more than 13,000 feet above the sea, or 8,000 feet above the level of the town. I should not myself have estimated the distance of Pike's Peak from Denver at much more than twenty miles.

From an agricultural point of view Colorado has one drawback. Owing to the absence of great heat in summer it is not possible to grow large crops of Indian corn as is done in many parts of the United States. Corn is grown, but the yield is so small that I doubt whether it is a profitable crop. In respect of other hindrances to successful farming, the Colorado beetle, as Mr. Barclay stated in an article which appeared about a year ago in the *Fortnightly Review*, has never been seen in Colorado.

Grasshoppers did a good deal of damage at one time, but I understand that they have not made their appearance of late years, and the farmers now say they are not much afraid of them, even if they should come, both because the area under crop being considerably larger than it was a few years ago, the damage done would be spread over a wider surface and therefore less felt, and also because they think they could find means of destroying them.

To anyone who is fond of sport Colorado offers great attractions. The mountain lakes are full of trout, and the marshy lands swarm with ducks. Deer and both brown and grizzly bears are to be found in the mountains.

I have as yet referred only to those emigrants who desire to settle upon arable lands. But it is well known that the breeding and rearing of cattle has attained large proportions in the United States. The profits of this business are not what they were, though they are still large. I have been told that a few years ago it was not uncommon for a cattle breeder to clear 80 or even 100 per cent. on his capital. But the profitable nature of the trade has induced large numbers of persons to engage in it with the usual and indeed inevitable result, that there has been a fall in profits. Still, I believe that with good management from 25 to 30 per cent. can still be obtained on the money invested. The business of cattle breeding in this country requires considerably more capital than arable farming, and this is the case also

in the United States. I believe the smallest number with which it is worth while to start is about 1,000 head of cattle. A mixed herd—that is, a herd of cows and calves, yearlings, two-year-olds and three-year-olds of this number—if composed, as is usually the case, partly of Texan and partly of what are called graded cattle—Texan or Colorados crossed with shorthorns or Hereford bulls—will cost about 3,000%. It takes three men to look after 1,000 cattle, and each of these men will receive about 75% a year with his board. Then each man requires several horses or ponies. No ‘cowboy’ ever thinks of walking; if he were to make his appearance on foot among the cattle, they would either charge him or there would be a general stampede. I do not think it would be prudent for anyone to go into the cattle business without a capital of some 4,000%. And the larger capitalists have a considerable advantage, because a large herd can be much more economically worked than a small one. The reason is that the number of men who have to be employed in looking after the cattle does not require to be increased in the same ratio as the herd. It takes three men to look after 1,000 cattle, but five men can look after 2,000, and a herd of 20,000 cattle can be worked much more economically than one of 2,000. I do not think that Colorado is a good place for the small capitalist, the man with 4,000% or 5,000%, to enter upon the cattle business. I was told that what was called the free ranches, the lands, that is, on which any one may turn out his cattle, were all overstocked; and that in consequence the cattle on them did not thrive or fatten as they used to do.

The really good ranches are virtually in the hands of a few owners. In theory it is open to any one to turn out his cattle on the plains, but the water frontages have been bought up and fenced off, and as the land is of no use without water for the cattle to drink, the man who owns the water frontage also practically owns the pasturage adjoining it; so that if any one now wishes to go in for cattle in Colorado, he must begin by buying out some one who owns a water frontage.

But there is still abundance of land in the United States over which a man may run his cattle free of charge. In Texas there are immense masses of fine pasture land as yet unoccupied. I should not, however, from what I have heard of the country, advise any one to go to Texas. The people in many parts of the state are very wild and lawless, and settlers in the southern part, near the Rio Grande, are exposed to the depredations of the Mexicans who come across the frontier and carry off cattle. Then Texas is very unhealthy for the better class of cattle. Cattle of improved breeds, if brought into Texas after they are twelve months old, succumb to the climate, and it is only by bringing them in very young that it is possible to acclimatise them. As for the native Texan cattle, they are the type of all that a beef producing animal should not be, they have narrow chests, long legs, and backs like razors. I never handled one, but they look as if they had very hard

hair and skins. Their beef is hard and stringy, and fetches the lowest price in the American market.

In the Territory of Wyoming there is still grazing land to be had free, and in Dakota and Montana there are large tracts still open. The ranchman has many hardships to bear. In summer he has to follow his cattle under a burning sun. In winter he has often to camp out in the snow. He has to be absent for long periods of time from civilised society, he has to live on hard fare, and often to dispense with many comforts which we have come to look on as necessities of life. He sometimes suffers heavy losses from dry summers and severe winters. Still, to many men, the free life in the open air has a quiet charm. I hardly think, however, that a settler, going out from this country, would act wisely in at once entering on the cattle business. It is a business which has to be learned like any other, and I think a young man going to the United States would do well to wait a year or two before he starts a herd of his own. This business is not like that of arable farming. Many men go out from this country to the United States who know very little of farming, and who after a time get on very well. They may make mistakes at first, but they come right at last. But then the land is always there to fall back on. But if a man invests his money in a herd of cattle, and mismanages them, he may lose not his income only, but his capital, or a great part of it. Sheep-breeding is practised on a large scale in Eastern Oregon and California, and in Montana, New Mexico, and Texas. The profits are large, but the risks are considered to be greater than in the case of cattle. Sheep require more attention than cattle. They are subject to scab and other infectious diseases to which cattle are not liable; and it is more difficult to bring them through a severe winter. In some of the ranges of Colorado there is a poisonous grass which kills sheep. Cattle either do not eat it or do not suffer from it. A considerable number of lambs are destroyed every year by the prairie wolves. As in this country, cattle and sheep do not thrive on the same pastures. The sheep eat out the best grasses, and leave nothing for the cattle but the coarser herbage. As a natural consequence, the men who turn out sheep on the free-ranges are very unpopular with the breeders of cattle. It does not appear that much attention has as yet been paid in the United States to the improvement of the breed of sheep. At the great cattle show held at Chicago in November last, the sheep from Canada, both Merinos and Cotswolds, were very superior to any that were exhibited by the flockmasters of the United States.

And now let me express a hope that none of those who may read this paper will be tempted to invest their means in this or that state, on the strength of what they may have read, without first making full enquiry for themselves. I should be very sorry to have such a responsibility put upon me. And let me put in a word by way of caution

to those who may be tempted by the offers of land in America on the part of the various companies which sometimes appear in the newspapers here. We may depend upon it these offers are not made out of pure benevolence, and that the vendor does not fail to put a very handsome bonus in his pocket. I will give an instance of the large profits which these middlemen sometimes expect. Some time since a company, with which I am connected, was offered a tract of land in Texas for 60 cents, or about half-a-crown an acre, by an American. We had sent out to the United States a gentleman from this country in whom we had confidence, with instructions to examine the lands which were offered for sale and to report on them. He informed us that the parties who were in possession of the Texas land grant offered the land at 40 cents, so that if we had closed with the offer of the American land speculator, he would have pocketed a commission of 50 per cent. As it happened, we did not purchase the land, but if we had bought it direct from the owners, the difference between the price which we should have given them and that which would have been received by the land speculator would have more than covered the remuneration and expenses of the gentleman whom we sent out to report, though he was several months in America, and travelled many thousand miles. If any considerable number of persons should think of trying their fortunes in the United States, I think they could not do better than follow the example of the farmers in the south of Scotland. Some two years ago they clubbed together and sent out some of their number to examine the country and report upon it. Any one who may go out with the view of obtaining information either for himself or his friends will find many of his countrymen either settled in the state and in Canada, or residing there temporarily, who will be ready to give him all the assistance in their power. And in every part of North America I believe that English and Scotch settlers are very popular; there is no jealousy of them, but they are welcomed as men who are likely to make good citizens, and to develop the resources of the country.

AIRLIE.

POSTSCRIPT.

Since the above paper was written, the contract between the Canadian Government and the Syndicate which has been formed for constructing the Canadian Pacific Railway has been laid before the Dominion Parliament. If I am rightly informed as to the terms of that contract, no maximum rates for freight are to be imposed on the railway company, but they are to be allowed to charge as much as they can get; and, further, the construction of any line that might compete with the Canadian Pacific is to be prohibited for a period of twenty years.

It may be that the political necessity for constructing the Canadian Pacific railroad is so great that the Canadian Government has had no choice but to accept these onerous terms. But I am afraid that they will militate very much against the rapid settlement of the country. It is clear that settlers in North-Western Canada, who are dependent on a railroad which has such an unqualified monopoly conferred on it, will be placed at a great disadvantage as compared with their neighbours in the United States, where any one can obtain a charter for a railroad if he can find the capital required to build it.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF LIBERALISM.

Two of our most prominent Liberal statesmen have incidentally furnished the public with definitions of Liberalism, and, in doing so, have, for the moment, by a curiosity of fate, exchanged rôles in the matter of literary expression. In more than one speech, Mr. Gladstone, has, with a brevity and point that recall Lord Sherbrooke, said in substance that 'Liberalism is trust of the people tempered by prudence, Conservatism distrust of the people tempered by fear.' At a Colston banquet, rather more than four years ago, Lord Sherbrooke, then Mr. Lowe, with a copiousness usually regarded as a characteristic of the Premier, gave four notes of a true Liberal. He was a man who, firstly, hoped more from the good that is in human nature than he feared from its evil; secondly, looked to the embodiment of great principles in legislation rather than to the manipulation of details by rule of thumb; thirdly, subordinated personal, sectional and local to national interests; and fourthly, respected institutions not because they were, but because they ought to be. Liberalism, in short, according to Lord Sherbrooke, works from faith in human nature, by means of general principles, in behalf of universal interests, and towards an ideal standard. Conservatism, he implies, may be conceived by reversing this picture.

The value of these definitions, struck out as they have been by the force of circumstances from minds at once enriched by the best culture of their time and continually in contact with public affairs, lies not merely in the abstract truth which they undoubtedly express, but in their adaptation to the practical realities of the case. The distinctive attitude of Liberalism has long been, still is, and to all appearance long will be, that of an attack upon the positions of Conservatism. In this attack, both the authorities quoted, and one of them in certain respects far more prominently and powerfully than the other, have been intimately engaged, and it is almost inevitable that a description by them of what they have been doing should furnish the directest attainable guide to Liberalism as a present and living fact. In this light, it is important to observe that the definitions given by the two statesmen are complementary and explanatory of each other. Whether or not Lord Sherbrooke's account of the notes

of Liberalism, if rigidly criticised, might be found to sin against the laws of logical division, it would not be difficult to show that his root-principle of faith in human nature gives origin to all the rest, while it is clearly the justification of Mr. Gladstone's assertion of 'trust of the people' as the substance of present political wisdom. This latter maxim again furnishes the practical method by which Lord Sherbrooke's generalisations are to be applied to the facts of life.

Is this root-principle of Liberalism sound? Is faith in human nature a safe ground to go upon? Is it true that more is to be hoped from the good than to be feared from the evil that is in mankind in general? The question, it should be observed, has regard to a comparative, and not to an absolute state of things. If it had been put with reference to the perfection, or even, perhaps, the perfectibility, of human nature, there could have been no hesitation about the answer. There is too much to find fault with in all men, and in some men there are depths of evil which one feels are too gently described by such terms as insane, inhuman, infernal, diabolical, or the most sinister epithets to be found in the vocabulary of condemnation. What is asked however is only whether for political issues, and in the construction of society, the nature of man may be assumed to be essentially a good or a bad, a trustworthy or an untrustworthy thing.

Here we are encountered by certain well-known and extensively accepted theological views, which represent human nature as entirely depraved. On this showing, there would, at first sight, appear to be no ground whatever for the faith on which Liberalism proposes to act. It is not necessary, however, to enter upon the formidable task of examining the theologian's proofs of his position, and that for three reasons. First, he does not affirm that the human nature at any given time existing on the face of the earth is entirely depraved, but only that it would be so, were it not for a special divine interposition of a corrective character, which, he assures us, is, and always has been, at work. Next, as he does not know on what scale this alleged interposition may be going on, and can only form a conjecture from what he sees; like other people, he is not in a position to say that it may not embrace all the faculties of all men. Lastly, he admits that his views are, in no case, inconsistent with the existence of any amount of what to all appearance are personal and social virtues, against which he has nothing to say except that in some instances, though in none for certain, they may be destitute of a peculiar religious character and value, required on what he claims as the authority of revelation, but which in no way unfits them for the purposes of ordinary life.

Feeling ourselves therefore at absolute liberty to put the question, Is human nature, as we find it, essentially good or evil? we open our eyes, and what do we see? Perfection? By no means. A vast amount of wickedness, folly, and weakness, but a vast amount of

virtue, wisdom, and strength as well, in perpetual conflict with the other ; and what we have to consider is whether the better do not preponderate over the worse elements in the struggle. That is a consideration which every one must deal with for himself on such evidence as lies within his reach. There is the net result of all human effort and struggle in the past, in the condition of the organised societies of the world as we see them. Some of them, it is true, are not much to boast of, but is not the worst of them a proof that the influences that go to put things right are stronger than those that go to put them wrong ? There are the people one comes across or hears authentically of in life. They are not all saints and sages certainly, but does not experience convey the impression that the number of individuals who are applying a fair amount of good sense and right motive to the business of the world, far outweighs those whose activity is of an opposite character ? Then there is one's own nature and career, of which, in the deeper springs of them, each man is generally a juster judge than those who can only bestow a glance on them from the outside. Is it conceivable that from any given number of men who have been induced to perform an efficient process of introspective criticism, a majority of reports, or even a single report, would be returned of an absolutely condemnatory character ?

What now is the joint effect of these different testimonies, all of them universally accessible ? Does it differ from the conclusion drawn by Evolutionary Science, working in a more recondite sphere, that the good elements in human nature have the power of a present, and the promise of a growing, victory over the evil ? The answer of Liberalism is distinctly, No. It affirms as a fact of Nature, that humanity as a whole merits respect and confidence, and that politicians and all who in any way occupy themselves with the protection and improvement of human society are engaged, not only in a generous, but in a hopeful, undertaking.

Can it be said that Conservatism founds upon this creed ? It would be invidious, and in many cases unjust, to say of individual Conservatives that they either despise the rest of society or are indifferent to its well-being. As private persons, dealing with humanity in concrete cases, they may be all that not only justice, but courtesy and kindness require. But that is not the point that is in question, and it merely furnishes an additional illustration of the commonplace that men are often better than their creed. We have to do with them as members of a public organisation that seeks to deal with society in the mass, and their estimate of mankind must be measured by the spirit which really gives life and shape to the body which they help to form. The two great political tendencies, the one to change and the other to resist change, have inevitably worked up the individual constituents of society into two colossal organisms

or personalities, the resultant of whose pulling in opposite directions determines the stage of advance occupied by society at any particular moment. These organisms naturally maintain themselves in existence by the continual attraction and assimilation of new individual members. The latter, as they emerge from political thoughtlessness, or political sleep, find themselves, from family or social circumstances, from personal predisposition or conviction, or otherwise, drawn into sympathy and ultimate incorporation with one organism or the other. Once in, however, they become filled with the animating and distinctive character of the structure of which they have become a part, and whatever the peculiarities of their private mind and feeling may be, their public spirit is the spirit of the organism, and the spirit of the organism is one which is transmitted from series to series of its component members, the traditional essence of it being, of course, subject to such modifications as the incidents of its history may impose.

Apart, then, from the private sentiments of individual Conservatives, what is the spirit of Conservatism as a public power? It is certain that nothing will account for its character and history so satisfactorily as the theory that it starts from a low view of human nature, especially as it is found in the great masses of society. When the Conservatism, with which the Liberalism of to-day is still in conflict, is traced back, its origin will be found in a conquering caste which managed by force or craft, or other outrageous means, to subject the rest of the community to its will. The history of Liberalism is mainly the history of the struggle of the subjugated community to emancipate itself from the bondage imposed on it by the conquering oligarchy, both lay and priestly, whether in the form of striking the fetters from its own liberties, or abolishing the privileges with which the dominating class had sought to fortify its position. It needs no detailed proof that at this stage of its career Conservatism was identical with a contempt of human nature, looking as it did upon the mass of men as fit only to be the thralls of the few.

It may be said that, even then, Conservatism must have respected human nature as represented in itself. That, however, may be doubted. Respect for the exception does not cancel contempt for the rule, and in the present instance it may be questioned whether even the respect for the exception could be very complete. The presence of pride in the use of power to subdue, the absence of certain elements of justice and generosity involved in treating other men as fit only for serfdom, form serious deductions from the needful warrants of self-respect, and their place is not supplied by eminent qualities for the council or the field.

Modern Conservatism may not be composed so exclusively of pride of superior power and the exercise of it in conquest as it was in its more ancient form, but those elements are still present in it in

more than sufficient abundance. The political tendency, for example, which has obtained notoriety under the name of Imperialism, is a revival of the old instinct of conquest. Moreover, there is a tendency on the part of many people who rise in life, and who appear not to be able to make more of their success than a ministry to their own self-esteem, to gravitate towards Conservatism, an indication that the 'barren principle of pride' and sympathy with it are still abundant and strong in its composition.

In the case of those who rise by the acquisition of wealth, this is not so surprising as it is in those whose superior education gives them a position. Universities were meant to enlarge as well as strengthen the whole nature of those who undergo their training, and it need not be said in how many instances they have served, or, at all events, have not defeated, this purpose. But in numerous cases also, the very opposite result is produced. Whether the fault lie in the kind of education given, or in the nature of the person receiving it, the possession of the conventional title of 'educated' spoils many men. Their education goes to their heads in the wrong sense. The chief use they make of it is to sustain a consciousness of being better than other people, and under the influence of this conceit of culture, often quite baseless in reality, they naturally drift towards the party whose historical origin and traditional spirit are identified with contempt for the mass of mankind. It is a singular commentary on the education furnished by Oxford and Cambridge that both Universities return Conservatives to Parliament. Conservatism boasts of the preponderating adherence of the educated classes. The fact, however, if it be one, suggests less the superiority of Conservatism than the doubtful value of much of our 'higher' education, and the rarity of the moral qualities necessary for carrying the full intellectual cup.

Another clearly marked survival of the feeling of the conquering caste is shown in the attitude of Conservatism whenever the question of property, and particularly property in land, comes into prominence. The principle of property, as opposed to that of a community of goods, stands on a sufficiently impregnable basis of argument. It has a higher public utility on its side than any other scheme for the distribution of possessions, and what more can any institution want to have said in its favour? But Conservatism seems to regard this as too pale and passionless a statement to rest on in the case of any attack, real or imaginary, on the principle of property. Its exponents treat those who wish to discuss the question as a social problem not so much in the light of erring controversialists whose reasonings require correction, as of a predatory horde that must be driven back from the camp with all possible speed. We have captured this booty for ourselves, touch it who dare! is no exaggerated representation of the tone in which Conservatism too frequently approaches property discussions. The idea of property as an arrangement based on social

expediency seems an insufficient justification. Because the individual has managed to be the first to get hold of something, he is entitled to keep it, as against the community, who are at the same time bound to protect him in possession. The plea comes as near as can be imagined to maintaining that property is theft, and quite right too. It is not, however, an unnatural plea in the mouth of a party whose traditions come down from those who took what they could get with the strong hand, the rest of society, or anything resembling rights on their part, not being worthy of consideration. That such spoliators, while they had the power, should make laws studiously protective of their own interests, and oppressive, whenever necessary, of the remainder of a community which they regarded as good for nothing but serfage, was no more than logical consistency demanded, and it would have been expecting too much to suppose that their political descendants would not be deeply tinged with the same spirit of class selfishness.

The spirit of contemporary Conservatism would, however, be very imperfectly analysed were it made to consist merely in pride of superiority and the assertion of class interest. In the struggle, inevitable everywhere, between patrician and plebeian, between the oligarchic and democratic tendencies in society, a time arrives when the people become too strong to be treated in the old contemptuous way. They have been gradually proving that there is more in them of good of every kind than they had been credited with, and the fact that it is so now begins to make itself felt. At the critical period of their recognising this fact a change comes over the spirit of the dominant class. It passes into a phase for which no better expression could be found than Mr. Gladstone's formula of 'distrust of the people tempered by fear.' The traditional feeling that the people must be kept under has in no way disappeared from the mind of the ruling class, but it is seen that it must be made effectual by different means. Formerly a scornful use of the requisite force was considered sufficient to put down any attempt at popular self-assertion. That, however, being no longer possible, argument must be resorted to. A resurrection is made of the Aristotelian distinction between those meant by nature to rule and those whom she means to be ruled, and Conservatism tacitly assumes that the first class consists of itself, and the second of the people. It is argued that the people are too ignorant, stupid, and selfish to be emancipated and trusted with power, and that if they get the upper hand in any way, society will go to pieces. It is not necessary to assume insincerity on the part of all Conservative advocates of such doctrines. Most of them are probably quite heartily of opinion that loss of power by themselves is equivalent to the destruction of society, the people being certain, in the madness which is assumed to be somehow or other inseparable from their position in the social scale, to wreck every institution that ministers to social well-being.

When matters have reached a crisis like this, Conservatism usually receives a great accession from two of the more weak and timid sections of society, whose presence serves to dilute the traditional imperiousness and fierceness of spirit hitherto characteristic of it, thereby imparting to it what, in its new circumstances, is the undoubted advantage of greater plausibility. The first of these classes consists of those who have become genuinely alarmed at the growth of popular power. Free, in a great measure, from the old harsh disdain of the people, they would gladly see them well governed, if they themselves were allowed to do it, but from popular self-government they shrink in terror. The people, they are certain, will selfishly combine to rob and oppress the other classes, or will foolishly force on legislation that must end in national ruin. Accordingly, they unite with the hitherto ruling class in an obstinate resistance to change.

In this they are joined by another class, whose characteristic is inertia, of mind or of will. Inertia of mind reveals itself in multitudes of people—it is they who expose Conservatism to the nickname of the ‘stupid party’—in a dulness of imagination, which disables them for shaping the idea of things as they are being ever replaced by an equivalent, to say nothing of a better, substitute. Their inborn detestation of change is shared by others whose inertia of will springs from indolence, and who, foreseeing that the introduction of new political ideas will involve a vast amount of trouble and the putting forth of increased energy to meet the new arrangements that must follow, set their faces against innovation from the very first as the most promising security for ease in the circumstances.

Such, then, is the genesis and the structure of fully developed Conservatism—the instinct of tyranny, allied with pride, class-selfishness, timidity, and inertia, all uniting in an under-estimate of the popular deserts and in a common chorus of ‘No!’ to every proposal from the popular party tending to their advance in liberty or power. If there should ever be some seeming abandonment of this attitude of universal negation, as when Conservatism yielded the Reform Act of 1867, it is not to be interpreted as a true and permanent departure from ‘distrust of the people,’ but simply as a proof that this distrust is being ‘tempered with fear,’ and is generally the act of some clever leader using the party’s instinct of self-preservation, to make it don for the nonce a mimetic Liberalism and offer a concession to popular demands, with the view, whether vain or otherwise, of better preserving the remainder of its ascendancy.

The Conservatism of to-day, recruited, and at the same time softened, as its original nucleus of imperiousness and domination has been, by tributary elements of political influence, no longer confides in mere force, but seeks to justify its position by argument. The sum of this argument, as we have already seen, is that the people are not to be trusted. Sometimes a preliminary objection is taken, that Liberalism is false to fact and to public interests in setting up a

separate party of 'the people' at all, that 'the people' means the whole people, rich and powerful people, as well as poor and unimportant people, and that Conservatism is the true party of the people, inasmuch as the policy it promotes is that which is best adapted to the interests of the whole community, and not of a section only. The answer is that the separation is unavoidable, because history cannot be cancelled. It is a fact that the comparative few had taken it upon them to govern the many at their own pleasure, necessarily imposing upon them in the process many oppressive disabilities. If the few had a right to do this, the many had just as good a right to say that they preferred governing themselves, and if they and their leaders have called themselves the party of 'the people,' it is because those whom Conservatism represents had previously divided the community into 'the people' and their masters. Liberalism is pressing on, as fast as Conservatism will allow it, towards the state of things when there shall be only one people, and need be only one party of the people, but that cannot happen until every unnecessary privilege, inequality, and relic of class domination has been replaced by arrangements befitting an undivided community that means to manage its own affairs. Liberalism, when interpreted by its aims rather than by its necessities, is not a battle for the supremacy of a class, but an effort to heal up a separation of classes originally made by a totally different social power.

Meanwhile, we must take 'the people' as they have been put before us, and consider what there is in the Conservative assertion of their political untrustworthiness. 'Thirty millions, mostly fools,' is the description given of them by one who has certainly not been Conservative in some very important matters, although in this criticism Conservatism seems to agree with him. The saying is a hard one. Is it true? Fools, if you will have it so, they may be in many things: in art, literature, science, eloquence, and the like. But the question here is not about such matters, but about what is needed to promote the widest diffusion of happiness in such a society as ours. Are they fools on such questions? They have been closest to the difficulties, and have been compelled to learn day by day, that practical wisdom which life teaches in its sternest school. How have they, on the whole, profited by the discipline? Look at our percentages of crime and pauperism. It is a pity they are not smaller, but taken as they stand, they show that the people keep themselves respectable and independent. In view of the fight that life presents to most, a population capable of that achievement are not entirely fools. In philosophy and æsthetics, for the refinements of intellect or taste, their capacity may not be great, but it would be strange if on some of the most perplexing and pressing political problems they could not contribute some elements of valuable judgment which we should look for in vain among those whose training has been acquired in the school of ease and pleasure, not of labour and necessity.

The quarters of society in which the statesman is most wanted are where the pressure of the social fabric is felt most keenly, and those are its foundations. What light should people of fortune, and culture be able to throw upon this? It is natural for them to form a world of their own, by which their aptitudes are determined, and in which these are serviceable. But it does not follow that because they are authorities in their own world, they should be so out of it. No one is entitled to blame them for making the best for themselves of their own world, and for, consequently, having little direct acquaintance with problems lying outside, or ability to solve them. But, on that very account, they are bound to acquiesce in the outside people having something to say in the outside affairs. The exasperation of the poor against the rich, which has so often in history led to revolution, has not been due to the mere contrast of fortune. The number of people who grudge the fairly earned prosperity of others is small; but it is a very different matter when the poor feel themselves excluded by the rich from a voice in redressing those social wrongs which they reasonably believe they understand best, and whose removal they conceive would give them a fair chance of achieving their natural share of well-being. In such a case, anger is not only probable, but proper.

Education, it must be remembered, is a relative term, and it is certain that much of our education has little to contribute in the way of producing political wisdom. Too often its principal effect is to mislead its possessor into the belief that he must be an authority, with the certain result that he will neglect those inquiries without which it is impossible to see what is the political difficulty which, at the moment, really requires to be grappled with, and what is the true way of settling it. Tried by experience, the political capacity of the people contrasts favourably, and in the most marked manner, with that of the classes who have claimed, in virtue of their better education, to be their rightful rulers and guides. The last half-century has seen a series of great acts of legislation, in all departments, constitutional, industrial, fiscal, educational and ecclesiastical, without parallel in the history of this country or probably of any other. The whole of this has been effected through the support of the people, bitterly opposed at every turn by Conservatism, in the name of all that was cultured and sacred. Fifty times it has been prophesied that society was going to pieces. Forty-nine of those times the prophecy has proved absolutely false, and as society is still holding together since the fiftieth, that will most likely prove false too.

If this does not show that in the present state of our education a fine gentleman is not necessarily a fine politician, and that a plain man who lives nearer the hard realities of life, and receives his teaching from them, may possess a more robust political intelligence than one who is familiar only with the notions floating in the world

of pleasure, it will be difficult to say what can be proved by fact and experience. It may be said that in many of those acts of legislation, the people were simply vindicating liberties for themselves, and that it requires no political wisdom for work of that sort. This plea, however, granting it to the utmost extent warranted by fact, only furnishes an opportunity of refuting a special ground on which Conservatism seeks to justify its distrust of democratic progress. It is said that the people will combine to use their power for inflicting injustice on the richer classes. Apart from the immense disadvantage under which those whose time is mainly engrossed in gaining their livelihood would labour in attempting such a combination, as compared with the facilities both of leisure and influence possessed by the rich for forming a combination of resistance, it may be asked is there any proof that the people have wished to commit such injustice when they had the opportunity? While demanding liberty for themselves, can it be shown that they ever insisted on more than that the law should deal out even-handed justice to rich and poor? The discipline of hard work conduces quite as much to the formation of a sense of justice as the life of luxury, and it is incredible that any proposal to make the law more favourable to the poor man because he is poor, or more oppressive to the rich man because he is rich, would receive any countenance from the bulk of the people of this country. Whether Conservatism, in opposing the concession of popular liberty, was giving to others the justice it claims for itself, is a question on which there is abundant room for at least a second opinion.

It is further said that, after all, the people have little credit in the political achievements in question, since they did no more than follow in the train of leaders who sprang from the rich and educated class. Without raising the question how far leaders are successful merely in proportion as they furnish the supply to a previously existing demand, the objection may be admitted in all its breadth, while at the same time claimed as substantiating what has already been advanced. The fact that so many great popular leaders have come from the classes above the people is a striking proof of the general theorem regarding human nature, which has been insisted on in opposition to the depreciatory view of it involved in the acts and pleas of Conservatism. That Liberalism should owe so much to the class whose temptations, prejudices, and interests tend so powerfully to generate Conservatism, is not only a remarkable tribute to the virtues and intellect of the great men who have thus overcome the force of their circumstances, but is further a proof that, however situated, human nature is ultimately able to produce an amount of good far more than sufficient to counterbalance its evil. As regards the assertion that the people have done little more than follow such leaders, as a mere matter of argument the apologist of the people is not concerned to deny it. The wildest democrat has never alleged that the people are able to excogitate in detail the

measures that are essential to the public good. Politics is a special branch of acquired skill, higher in degree only than shoemaking, and it is not necessary that the people should be their own politicians any more than their own shoemakers, if in both cases they know where the shoe pinches. The working politician must study his craft as much as the working shoemaker, a consideration which reduces the question to one of leisure. As a rule the people cannot be expected to rear their own most finished leaders, simply because their position does not admit of the necessary amount of spare time.

It is really here that the opportunity of the Conservative classes lies. If they would employ their leisure and opportunities in acquiring the true power that lies in political knowledge, sagacity, and sympathy, there might never be a question of antagonism between Liberalism and Conservatism. As things stand, it is the leisure which wealth procures that has sent the greatest leaders of Liberalism from among the rich. As far as the education current among those who can best afford it goes, probably the chief assistance derived from it for a political career is the art of reading. But the time and the access to information ensured by wealth are invaluable, and those who have employed these in the right spirit to gain a mastery of politics as a ministry to human happiness, have almost of necessity had the people at their command. What the people have contributed has been mainly in the way of suggestion and recognition. Being nearest the points at which the social system presses most severely on society itself, they have been able to intimate to the competent statesman where his first task lay, and it has been their distinction that when they have heard the language of justice and practical wisdom, they have known its value and made it victorious by their support.

This is not to say that the people are infallible. Liberalism does not profess to maintain such a thesis. Its 'trust of the people' must be 'tempered with prudence.' The people are not, in the mass, fully trained politicians, just as they are not fully trained anatomists or physiologists, and they might without knowing it be led far enough astray if left to themselves or to designing or unskilful handling. But is not the same thing true of the Conservative classes? Would it be difficult to persuade the House of Lords to do a foolish thing? Might not Convocation itself be lashed into most unholy rage by some excited zealot? No doubt a self-seeking demagogue may abuse the honesty and ignorance of the people; but almost every clever swindler succeeds for a time with the people he practises on. Conservatism itself has occasionally been victimised by the adventurer and the charlatan. The true popular leader, accordingly, who understands his function and feels his responsibility, will never forget that while the people have the capacity as well as the right to direct in their own affairs, their wisdom necessarily has its limits, and he will

not shrink from putting himself forward to oppose the fool, the fanatic, or the knave, when he sees them seeking to lead the people beyond their depth. Such has undoubtedly been the history of the Liberal statesmanship of England. From time to time crowds here and there have been deluded by unscrupulous or incompetent agitators. But wise and earnest leaders have not been afraid to pit themselves against such pseudo-leaders, in the belief that while the people might be temporarily deceived by the glitter of the false metal, they would not fail to recognise the ring and weight of the true when it was presented to them. And the result has fully justified their confidence. The whole history of English Liberalism is a proof that there is not only no danger, but the most invaluable positive good, in democracy when wisely and courageously led.

Yes, but what security is there that it will always be wisely and courageously led? is the Conservative rejoinder. Who knows how soon it may fall into the hands of the political rogue or mountebank? Here again we have the root-heresy of Conservatism, its disbelief in the capacities of human nature, presenting itself with a persistency of iteration which irresistibly suggests the suspicion that the human nature with which Conservatism is conversant in itself may be too largely composed of those lower elements which are admittedly allied with the higher. The security we have for a wise and courageous leadership of the English people in the future is exactly the same as the security we have for a water-supply in the future. We know there will be rain, because we know there will be the ocean to yield clouds at the bidding of the sun. Humanity as represented in the English race is as much a fact of nature as the ocean, and its productive capacities are as much to be relied on. What reason is there to suppose that the race which has given us the great statesmen of the past and the present cannot give the world their equals in the future? The conceit which thinks that there will never be anything seen again on earth like itself, it may be hoped will prove correct, though in a different sense from its own. But the race may wear out. So, we are told, will the supply of coal; but surely it would be prudence run mad to provide for that. If the time comes when the leisured class of England cannot produce political leadership for the busy, it will matter very little to England whether she is misruled by a headless mob or an effete aristocracy.

The charge against Conservatism is a serious one. In any case it is a singular thing for a comparatively small number of people in a nation to stand up and say to the rest, 'You sit still, we will do the whole business.' The nation might very well answer, as it has answered, 'Thank you, we prefer to do our own business ourselves, and if you try to stop us, we shall not let you.' If the people were clearly incapable of doing the business, there might be some show of justification for saying, 'These madmen will bring themselves and

us to ruin ; we must put them down, and guide things our own way. But when, as the issue has shown, the people have a fund of political wisdom which Conservatism lacks, the whole position becomes ludicrously untenable. And yet this mistaken contempt for human nature as represented in the mass of the nation lies beyond doubt at the heart of Conservatism, in spite of the Reform Act of 1867, granted because it was impossible to make a better of it, and not in the faith that an increase of popular power was right in itself, and would strengthen the State. It is not respect for the people which prefers military glory among foreigners to the development of domestic civilisation, and believes that the people whose vital interests are thus neglected will be delighted with the gewgaw substitute ; or which, when the nation emphatically condemns such a way of dealing with its fortunes, accounts for its verdict by insulting considerations ; or which, when a large section of the population, rendered desperate by immediate calamity and the accumulated wrongs of past misrule, becomes clamorous and dashes out wildly in all directions for relief, slights a policy of reasonable concession as the justification of reasonable firmness, and regards effectual suppression by brute force as the best that such rebels deserve.

To this initial mistake on the point of fact may be traced all those shortcomings of Conservatism which, as already mentioned, Lord Sherbrooke indicates through their Liberal antitheses. Of these latter, one is that Liberalism works for national interests, and not for those of the individual or the class. Believing in man, it works for man, and not merely for certain men. Conservatism virtually reverses the process. How should it do otherwise ? A low view of human nature leads to cynicism, and cynicism to selfishness. Why trouble ourselves about a crowd of fools or brutes ? let us fence in a life of power, plenty, and elegance for ourselves—is the natural language of those who, seeing nothing great and worth working for in general humanity, remain strangers to the highest aim in public life ; and although the sentiment may not always or commonly be put so harshly, it states the standard by which the different degrees of it may be measured. That Liberalism should be dissatisfied with things as they are—if they are not what they ought to be—and should aim at the ideal state of society, is a necessary corollary from its adoption of universal interests as the object of its action, as also is its employment of general principles in policy and legislation as its means to its end. What it wants to effect is the highest happiness, not of a class, but of all, and as long as the ideal state of society has not been reached, it has no security that some portion of it may not be suffering unnecessarily. Moreover, it knows that ideal grievances may often be as prolific of pain as material ones. To many, liberty is only second to food, and a needless inequality as vexing as an excessive tax. For forwarding such an ideal state, the application of general principles to politics is indispensable. Without them universal justice

is unattainable ; it is of them alone we can be sure that they will find their way through every passage and into every nook and cranny of society, rectifying, on their path, every rectifiable abuse to which they are adapted ; and Liberalism accordingly is, in one aspect of it, an incessant effort for the realisation of the general principles of social well-being, in its ideal form, to the utmost extent, and at the earliest date, that practical emergencies will allow.

To Conservatism, all this necessarily seems foolishness. Realising the ideal state of society is for it a dream. At any given stage of history it is satisfied that the best attainable condition of things is already in existence, the wonder being that it is so good. Even if mankind deserved to have any risk incurred for them, the risk is too great. They are so foolish and so selfish that to give them liberty to lay hands on the existing framework of affairs would infallibly lead to mischief, and probably ruin. Accordingly, while Liberalism, in the case of any proposal of social improvement which makes out a probable case, acts on the presumption that society ought to be credited with the will and capacity to do it justice, to Conservatism the only safe policy seems resistance to change. We know what we have, we do not know what we may lose. As for general principles of social amelioration, what zeal on their behalf is possible in presence of this despairing and everlasting No ?

In the light of this contrast of Liberalism and Conservatism in respect of their psychological basis, it is equally easy to understand and to disregard much of the alarm¹ by which Conservatism is at the present moment agitated in view of some of the actual proceedings and alleged tendencies of Liberalism. A sort of 'Radicalism' is said to be rising into influence, which, if it gets its own way, will not only injure the British Constitution, but absolutely destroy society. This is formidable enough, if true, but the same cry has often been heard before, and has not hitherto been followed by much that need have been feared. 'Radicalism' is a vague term which can easily be made to cover a great deal. A Radical has been defined by an eminent authority as an 'earnest Liberal ;' and this account of the relations of the two might probably be completed by defining a Liberal as a prudent Radical. It being of the essence of Conservatism to be stationary, division in its ranks is abnormal. There can be no separating where everybody stands still. Liberalism, being the party of movement, almost of necessity splits into a faster and a slower section, the question between them referring, not to the destination, but to the pace. The rule has been that Liberalism, as a whole, has in the end put in force the anticipations of Radicalism, so called, and if the present alarms of Conservatism are not a mere beating of the air, they must be intended to intimate that, as usual, Liberalism as a whole will

¹ For some illustrations of this reference may be made to Mr. Mallock's article on 'The Philosophy of Conservatism' in the *Nineteenth Century* for November, 1880.

drift into adopting the speciality of Radicalism, and that this time it will end in the destruction of society.

In proof of this, it is said that Radicalism is tempting Liberalism on to undermine the principle of property. If that be true, it may with safety be predicted that Radicalism has no chance of success. The institution of property is too deeply rooted in the self-love and sense of justice of mankind for the principle of thorough-going communism ever to obtain any extensive or permanent hold in society. A certain amount of it is probably inseparable from all State life—since property is merely a matter of expediency, and possesses no religious sacredness, while State life is impossible unless the individual and his possessions to some extent belong to all. But a native and healthy egoism makes it a pain for every man to part with what his own powers have produced or acquired. It is like lopping off a part of himself, and nothing can heal the amputation except the substitution of what he considers an equivalent. So strong is this feeling that the attempt to work society universally and permanently on any other footing would be found impracticable. But the mass of men have sufficient acuteness and sense of equity to understand that they can be allowed to retain their own productions or acquisitions only on condition of every other person being allowed to retain his. That this involves acquiescence in inequality of property is plain, and there is no proof that men spontaneously grudge this inequality, where it has not directly or indirectly been brought about in an unnatural, violent, or otherwise inequitable manner. In that case they will probably demand the interposition of the State to redress the inequalities created by traditional or contemporary injustice, or by public calamity; but such an interposition will be not an invasion, but a restoration, of the principle of property.

Communistic or other principles hostile to property seldom find much acceptance except where large classes are next door to destitution, where, though labouring to the fullest extent of their ability, and even beyond, they can with difficulty secure the barest necessities of life. Among people who have so little experience of the 'magic of property,' it is not surprising that there should not be much zeal in its behalf. Besides, such a condition of the labouring class is very frequently the result of past misgovernment, carried out in the name of the whole community, and it is a genuine hardship demanding some redress, if one class has to bear all the disadvantage which misgovernment is certain to cause somewhere, while the others enjoy such compensatory advantages, as it may have been used to snatch. In any case, it will always be a consideration for a wise statesmanship whether, in such an emergency, an effort on the part of the State ought not to be made to start a desperate and therefore dangerous class on a career in which they may come to feel what property is. Although this can of course only be done by means of the property of

others, it would be pedantic literalism to call it communism. It is really using property to secure property. In the present condition of English Liberalism, however, there is no symptom of the slightest relaxation of the notion of property. Accordingly, a reproduction of the Aristotelian arguments against a community of goods, and elaborate defences of complete liberty to acquire property, on the ground that it is the stimulus to all those exertions of the individual by which society profits most highly, that it gives scope for the development of the benevolent virtues, &c., are entirely superfluous. *Quis vituperavit?*

Radicalism, it is said. But has it? Even Radicalism should not be painted blacker than it is. What are the cases in which Radicalism has done this evil thing? For one, we are pointed to the Irish Compensation for Disturbance Bill of last year. Radicalism, it is said, entered into the Government, and under its disastrous influence they proposed this Bill for undermining the principle of property and so destroying society. But the Bill as described by its promoters was the very reverse of this. On their showing it was a bill for conserving society with a view to strengthening the principle of property. As far, therefore, as its avowed doctrine is concerned, the Radicalism that desired this Bill is unjustly accused. But the Bill, it is maintained, led by necessary consequence to the dangerous conclusions stated. Let us see. A great calamity had made so many small tenants in Ireland unable to pay their rents, that, in the peculiar and too well-known circumstances of that country with regard to land, the rigid enforcement of the law regulating contract for rent was, as stated, on his responsibility, by the head of the Government, bringing matters 'within a measurable distance of civil war.' It was accordingly proposed that the law, enforcing the payment of rent, should be suspended for a short time in certain districts, when the tenant was demonstrably unable to pay through the calamity, and was willing to enter into reasonable arrangements as to the future. A proposal like this, it is alleged, subverts property and destroys society.

First, it is said, there is no more reason why an Irish landlord should make up his tenant's losses out of his own pocket, than why the second party in any other contract, anywhere else in the country, should have his calamities made good by the first. A poor curate, it is argued, must pay his wealthy tailor's bill, or take the consequences, and it is hard that a landlord should be refused his rent 'because he is fat or vulgar, or keeps a French cook. But such caricature loses its effect, through failing to mark the vital difference between a private and a public calamity. A great calamity that prostrates whole classes and districts and threatens to shake the social fabric, may demand an interposition of the law that is not called for in the case of suffering by an isolated individual, which, however

hard upon him, does not menace society. But in that case, it is said, why should not the burden be borne by the whole community? why should the landlord be made to bear it all? But does he? and if he did, why should he not?

The case put by the Radicalism that befriended the Bill was, that the evicting landlord would be enabled, by the calamity that had occurred, to effect his purpose without providing the compensation which he would have been compelled to give in ordinary circumstances, so that no hardship was imposed on him by creating some counterpoise to this unforeseen and unintended advantage. Moreover, the design of the measure was that the rent should ultimately be paid in full. Besides, the Bill was part of a great policy intended, and fitted, to produce in Ireland a peace, order, and contentment, which it has not known for centuries, and the effect of which must be to make property more secure, and therefore more valuable. It may suit the conceptions of human nature entertained by Conservatism, to maintain that the chronic discontent of the Irish peasantry, which means the bulk of the Irish people, is due to mere wanton wickedness, has no foundation in any wrong that is arguable before the tribunal of natural justice, if nowhere else, and that the only course to be taken with them is to enforce the law, by dragonnade if necessary, and leave the victims of it to starve if they cannot comply. But Liberalism would be untrue to its faith in humanity if it assumed that the continuous cry of a whole people could be absolutely unreasonable, or that the policy of meeting what might be found reasonable in such a cry would not obviate the necessity of resort to what might prove virtually civil war. If such a policy created peace and security, the ultimate gain to owners of property would far more than compensate any temporary sacrifice that might have been required of them in carrying it out.

A further question, however, has to be answered. Does the doctrine of property require that in all circumstances, no matter how abnormal, society shall secure the holder of property in absolute and unimpaired possession of it, without the possibility of risk, or the dream of loss? Such a demand seems inconsistent both with the principle and the practice usually associated with property. It must be repeated that there is nothing more sacred or inviolable in property than in any other institution. It is an arrangement justified by the good of society, and may be infringed when and as far as the good of society demands. Now society, by its practice, does not appear to undertake the absolute securing of the owner in his property. As regards the natural disasters to which property is exposed, this requires no illustration. But it applies in other ways as well. The State will do its best to protect the owner of property against fraud and robbery, but if the protection fails, he must take his chance; and every owner of property must be understood to have taken it on that understand-

ing. Is not this substantially the case of the Irish landlord at the present moment? It may be a misfortune for him and for everybody that his land should be the centre of a ceaseless social war, maddened by poverty and traditions of injustice, and it is clearly his interest that his property should be rescued from this peril, and made tenable by him under safer and more creditable conditions. But is he entitled to demand that society shall do this for him gratis? It is not existing society's fault that his land is at the bottom of all this mischief. As matters go, the State cannot be expected to guarantee him absolutely against all loss. The line must be drawn somewhere, and to draw it at social war does not appear unreasonable. The State is bound to do its best to quell the social war—of course not by inhuman methods—and to extricate his property for him, but if in the process of pulling it out some fragment of it has to be parted with, he must simply take his chance of that. Had the State improved his land for him, he could not have objected to a special rate on his land in return, and in the circumstances of Ireland there would be no invasion of principle or practice in regard to property, were landlords asked to make a sacrifice in order to secure a settlement.

But, it is further alleged, the Disturbance Bill, and all similar proposals, teach the people a bad lesson. Once relieve them from paying rent, and they will wish to be relieved always; once relieve them from their obligations to landlords, and they will wish to have a similar deliverance from bakers, grocers, butchers, &c. Then the people of England and Scotland, seeing the people of Ireland thus privileged to put their hands into their neighbours' pockets, will desire to possess a similar privilege, and so property will be extinguished, and society will be destroyed. The answer to all this is that the people are neither such knaves nor such fools as Conservatism takes them for. They can comprehend the logic of an exception. After all it is not so difficult to understand that taking medicine when you are ill does not carry with it the abandonment of food for ever afterwards. That the people of Ireland would have desired to convert the proposed exception into a permanent and universal rule, and having once in their dire necessity been temporarily relieved, after strict legal inquiry, from the penal consequences of obligations they were unable to meet, would have deliberately formed the purpose of never afterwards paying what they owed to any one, and that the people of England and Scotland would have followed them in this determination, is so extraordinary a proposition that very powerful proof ought to be produced by those who put it forward. No such proof, however, is offered except that such is human nature, which is sufficiently met by the counter-assertion that human nature deals reasonably when it is reasonably dealt by.

The Conservative suspicions, apprehensions, and ill-disguised

class-selfishness of the House of Lords have prevented us from seeing how the Disturbance Bill would have actually worked. The exasperation arising on its rejection, and the opportunity which that rejection furnished to politicians whose aims avowedly go far beyond land reform, make it impossible to regard what has since happened in Ireland as affording any key to what would have followed the passing of the Disturbance Bill into an Act. But the refusal to pay rent, and defiance to the law to take its course, is certainly not correctly interpreted when it is set down to a communistic motive. It is simply a piece of political tactics, indefensible if you please, but directed to other aims than the subversion of the idea of property. On the other hand, it is noticeable that the very wildest schemes of land reform are those which, on the face of them, promise to do most for establishing property as an institution. To create half a million of small landlords by buying out the necessary number of large ones with many millions of national money would be a practical token of respect to the notion of property that could not be easily paralleled. Labourers attempt to show that the system of small properties in land, if carried out into all other spheres of property, would practically destroy the stimulus to exertion in the acquisition of property by which society benefits so largely. But to make this argument good, it would require to be shown that those who advocate the encouragement of small properties by law, also advocate the prevention by law of all except small properties. If there are Radicals who desire this, their number is so limited that they cannot count in any fair endeavour to estimate the actual or probable drift of the popular mind. Radicalism may be a very bad thing, but there is no evidence that it is doing anything with the principle of property beyond seeking to make some new and, as it believes, more profitable applications of it, or that, if it did, it would receive any countenance from the common sense and justice of the people at large. The destruction of society, accordingly, by Liberalism, on this score, may be set down as a bugbear.

Another way in which Radicalism is said to be dragging Liberalism towards the destruction of society, has reference to its alleged hostility to an hereditary peerage, and its functions in the legislature. The abolition of the House of Lords is a question which there will probably be abundance of time to consider, but meanwhile it may be remarked, that unless Conservative writers and speakers have some better arguments in reserve than those which they are in the habit of using, the case for their favourite institution must be weaker than might otherwise have been supposed. The idea involved in a Second Chamber is one for which we shall seek in vain for a parallel in any other department of business. What municipal council, railway or banking board, commercial firm, single trader, professional man, or head of a family, ever wants another council,

board, firm, trader, practitioner, or family head with power of veto to prevent it or him from getting on with the work? The answer made is that rashness is unadvisable, and that delay may often be useful in legislation or administration, as if there were no delay provided in the House of Commons. But rashness is unadvisable in everything, yet it has passed into a proverb that delays are dangerous, the opinion of mankind apparently being that the best course on the whole is not to lose time in executing a resolution to which one has come after the best consideration he has been able to give to it, and to accept the correction of experience if a mistake has been made. Why should it be otherwise in the business of a nation? What national benefit has been gained by the repeated instances in which the House of Lords has thwarted the House of Commons and then yielded? Has the delay, or rather stoppage, of the Irish Disturbance Bill been proved to be a blessing?

But, it is said, the House of Lords, being responsible to no constituents, can furnish an independent criticism unattainable otherwise. But that is precisely what it cannot do. The House of Lords, like every political body, naturally falls into two parties, and party leadership and opinion belong to the Commons. If on any special point the House of Lords should be recalcitrant, the minister who leads the dominant party in the House of Commons has, in his power of creating new peers, an effectual weapon for securing consent, and the knowledge of this makes really independent criticism by the House of Lords, except in trifles, impossible. You may, if you like, elect to conduct your business on the plan of planting an adviser opposite you, empowered to stop you when he sees you resolved on doing something rash, but if at the same time you produce a revolver and give him to understand that he had better not stop you when you really want to go on, most people will think that you have given yourself a good deal of trouble for nothing. Yet in what other position does current Conservative apology leave the country in relation to the House of Lords?

On its showing it does not appear that society would be destroyed, or even much damaged, were the feeling against an hereditary Second Chamber ascribed to Radicalism to be successful in its aims. The legitimate power of the higher classes in the public life of the country would still remain, and an influential Parliamentary career would still be open to 'hereditary prudence, hereditary honesty, and hereditary ambition,' wherever they might be found. There is not the slightest reason to suppose that a man who had used the opportunities which wealth had given him to perfect his character and capacities for public usefulness, would be otherwise than greatly aided in the attainment of popular leadership and political influence by the presumption in his favour legitimately created by the possession of an historic name and that perfection of manners

which is the distinction of an aristocracy with traditions. To this not even hereditary title is essential, and the question might be left perfectly open, whether title, if retained at all, might not be more profitably employed as a reward for personal service alone. It is no part of Liberalism to make a blind tilt against inequality, but only against unjust or inexpedient inequality. The same instincts which naturally prompt the mass of mankind, when not maddened by want, to acquiesce in property, dispose them also to acquiesce in inequality. The two are indeed indissolubly bound up together, and recognition of the one involves recognition of the other.

To have my own and all I can gain for myself, I must allow everybody else the same right. Hence in a state of society where the law has not interposed to give one individual the advantage over another in the race of life, there will be no room for envy, and there will not be much envy. Inequalities clearly traceable to nature, or even to better luck, and not tainted by injustice, will be accepted by the mass of mankind, as will also those official inequalities which are necessary for the performance of the work of the State. It needs no argument to prove that this sentiment holds good of power and honour, as well as possessions. Where the law creates an inequality which is clearly irrational, as when it patronises one religion in preference to another, while destitute of the infallibility necessary to decide which, if either, is true, its action is resented. In such a case the sense of what is due to public utility is outraged, since, for anything the law knows, it may be enervating the public mind by superstition, instead of strengthening it by truth and virtue. Where again the law gives power or honour to some and denies it to others, for no reason of public utility, but seemingly out of mere favouritism, Liberalism must seek the removal of the inequality, both because in such a case the sum of general happiness is diminished by the unjust disappointment caused to those who are neglected, and because a spirit of servility is encouraged in the community by every act of respect and obedience which is exacted for artificial reasons. But where a man's power and honour are his own, either because he has fairly won them by his merits, or has fairly come by them in some way, or where he wears them as the reward or the instrument of public service, the assent of Liberalism is instantaneous and unhesitating. For this reason the upper classes have, in the leadership of a people daily adding educated intelligence to the teachings of life, an opportunity of rising to the enjoyment of a power which is as much superior to that exercised by their ancestors among their vassals by aid of sword and halberd, as moral influence is to material force.

This consideration also disposes of another charge of destroying society brought against Liberalism in its relations to the new Radicalism. The latter is said to be busy propounding the doctrine that Parliament exists not to pass laws for the people, but to give

formal sanction to laws which the people have already virtually passed. Even had Radicalism taken to preaching this, it would be nothing so very far amiss, when properly understood. It is surely not going to be maintained that Parliament is to spend its time in passing laws which the people do not need; and what key can be had to the people's needs, unless it be their expressed wishes? Grievance before Supply is no novelty in the constitution, and it is to be hoped there is no design anywhere to have the spirit of that arrangement reversed. That the people should take a deep interest in the proceedings of Parliament, and should make their remarks on them, is inevitable, more particularly now that through the telegraph and the press the great council of the nation virtually conducts its business in the immediate presence of the nation. In the initiative of national business, and in all parts of the making of laws dependent on the special political skill which the legislator ought to possess, a competent Parliament is not more likely to be interfered with by the people than a tried family solicitor by a sensible client in transacting the business of the estate and drawing the necessary deeds. At times the solicitor may anticipate or even overrule the client's judgment for his good, in the certainty of an ultimate indemnity. But does that imply that Parliament is to make a rule of going on in contemptuous disregard of the national will as to the necessity, the nature, and the great structural principles of legislative measures? What strengthening of society is expected from such procedure?

There is the less necessity for alarm on this score, that the formation of the national will is greatly in the hands of competent politicians, if they choose to exert themselves. No more signal or instructive illustration of this is to be found than the remarkable achievement of the present Premier in overthrowing the late Government by a persistent appeal to the people on grounds of reason, fact, and sound policy. It is right that the wiser part of the world should guide those who, in the particular matter in question, may not be so wise, while yet wise enough to recognise wisdom when they hear it. But if those who are wise dislike the necessary trouble, if they prefer to go into a corner and sulk at the success of inferior men, all that can be done is to rebuke them for their self-indulgence, and remind them that they should be the last to complain. Liberalism, however, would be false to its creed and to the patent facts of English political life if, in despair of wise leadership for the people or popular preference for wise leadership, it should pause in any course dictated by the demands of social justice. When a nation's security ceases to be consistent with the progress of justice, it has passed its prime, and no amount of Conservatism will arrest its decline. There then remains for the patriot only the tragic consolation, that although a people may fail, the race has an inexhaustible future.

THE CITY PAROCHIAL CHARITIES.

THE question of the City parochial charities must soon receive the attention of the Legislature. It is fully ripe at any rate for discussion, and the interval which must elapse before its final settlement may well be occupied by efforts to contribute to the solution of a sufficiently perplexing problem. A crude or hasty measure of reform would be much more disastrous than the existing state of things, for at present the mischief is local and disorganised.

The story may be briefly retold. Centuries ago, London meant the City, and the City meant London. The suburbs, as we have them in these days, were the country; the West-end of to-day was non-existent; south of the Thames were a few steady-going villages and the quaint 'Boro'; the East-end, instead of teeming with that dull, uncomplaining, laborious life of which few of us know much, was dotted with picturesque hamlets; the large mass of the people of the metropolis dwelt within the square mile, which is now almost exclusively identified with the mercantile life of the metropolis, but which then was synonymous with the word 'London.'

With the view of helping their fellow-citizens, good folk, living, be it remembered, in ages differing widely from our own, often bequeathed lands or money to be administered by the authorities of the parish in which they had passed their days. One legacy would take the form of providing the poor with bread or clothing or coals; another would be intended to insure the maintenance of the parish church and the continuation of its services; a third would make provision for apprenticing poor boys or bestowing a marriage portion on needy maidens; a fourth would be designed to found pensions for old and unfortunate parishioners. These purposes may once have been wisely and regularly fulfilled. Whether they were or not, is of no consequence now; probably it did not much matter at the time, for the amount to be administered was often so small that its misapplication could not have been very harmful to the community.

But at the present time the complexion of the question is quite changed. The poor people, for whose direct or indirect benefit these bequests were intended, are not now, as a class, or to any considerable degree, resident in the City of London. The provision which was

made for them^{has}, by reason of the altered value of money and property, increased to an extent which could never have been foreseen. Chiefly, much of the work which these charities were primarily meant to do is now effected by the agency of settled law, and what in by-gone ages was considered, and perhaps actually was, generous and beneficial to the poor, is in our own day admitted to be dangerous and disastrous to the public well-being. This is the story in outline; it will be necessary to fill it in.

It is requisite, first of all, to realise the rapid decrease of the residential population of the City; and the Royal Commissioners, upon whose recent Report I propose to base most of the facts of this article, felt that sufficient illustration of this was afforded by noting the variations of the last three censuses. The number of inhabited houses has thus decreased:—

1851	14,786
1861	13,484
1871	9,394

The diminution in population, showing a small decrease in the proportion of persons to each house, is equally striking:—

1851	131,127
1861	114,039
1871	76,236

There is every reason to suppose that the next census will show a still further decrease, a presumption sufficiently warranted by the fact that during the last eight years the reduction in the number of children attending elementary schools within the City limits has been fully 25 per cent.¹ But to take the population as it was ten years ago, an analysis of the 76,236, thus shown to be actual residents of the City, discloses that only 16 of the 108 parishes, into which the civic area is divided, have populations of over 1,000. These 16 account for 55,262 of the inhabitants, thus leaving 20,974 persons to be assigned to the remaining 92, an average of 227 parishioners a-piece. But this is not all; 22 parishes—one must use the word for want of a better—cannot show over 100 inhabitants; 5 have not even 50.

The cause of this decline is of course ready to hand. Within less than a generation the City of London has been quite transformed. New thoroughfares, railway stations, piles of stately offices and hideous warehouses now occupy space on which stood the dwelling-houses of rich trader and poor artisan. The shopkeeper has not had much to complain of. The transit from residential citizenship to suburban life has been smoothed by the award of a generous arbitrator, and,

¹ I take this fact from the Report of the Educational Endowment Committee of the London School Board. Their investigation into the City parochial charities, pursued under great difficulties and discouragements, is a triumph of patience and care.

though no longer sleeping within the City, the evicted tradesman is practically as much a citizen as ever. It has been otherwise with the labouring man. The civic happy hunting-grounds are his no longer, and not only has the City ceased to be the home of the wage-earning classes, but what are vaguely styled 'the poor' are no longer to be found, as a body, dwelling within its boundaries. Of this abundant testimony is given by the witnesses before the Royal Commission. 'There are no resident poor;' 'we have no actual poor in the parish;' 'the Cannon Street Railway station occupies a great part of the parish;' 'there are about twenty persons who have claims on the parish, of whom scarcely one resides in the parish now;' 'practically there are no poor in the parish;' 'I have tried in vain to find these poor persons; I cannot find a poor person who has any possible claim on the parish;' 'we have no poor: St. Bartholomew's Hospital comprises all the parish, save one house, and the only residents in the parish are the hospital staff;' 'there may be a poor person, one cannot tell; but there is very little chance of there being poor in St. Christopher-le-Stock, because the whole property is now absorbed in the Bank of England;' 'there is one poor widow who lives in the parish: she lives over one of the warehouses;' 'there are no poor at all;' 'the parish is becoming more or less desolate.' Emphatic statements like these are made by the representatives of more than one half of the City parishes.

I pass now to a consideration of the amount available for the charitable or spiritual benefit of the people of the City of London. Strangely enough, it has for a long time been bearing an inverse ratio to the ends it was designed to meet. The people have decreased; the money meant for them has increased. In 1865 the gross income of the parochial charities was 67,480*l.* 16*s.* 6*d.*; five years later it had risen to 85,210*l.* 5*s.* 8*d.* In 1876, the year taken by the Royal Commissioners for the purposes of their inquiry, it amounted to 104,904*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.*; of this latter sum 81,014*l.* 15*s.* 1*d.* was under the uncontrolled administration of the local authorities, schemes for the disposal of the balance having been obtained from or submitted to the Court of Chancery or the Charity Commissioners. Nor is there any reason to suppose that the various properties from which the income of these charities is derived have yet reached their maximum value. As leases fall in, they are obviously only renewable in proportion to the largely enhanced value of all City property. The parish of St. Peter-le-Poer is now receiving 1,450*l.* a year for an estate which till seven years ago only produced 60*l.* This is one instance of many. The parish estate of St. Martin Vintry will increase very considerably in the course of seven years: 'there will be an enormous increase.' In St. Christopher-le-Stock there will be 'for the future a very considerable surplus.' The parish estates of St. Dunstan in the East will 'continue to increase.' The properties of St. Giles, Cripplegate, and of St. Bartholomew, Moor

Lane, are 'still increasing in value:' in St. Mary Aldermary 'there will most likely be a large increase in the income of the parish charities in the course of a few years:' the value of Lady Bacon's estates in the parish of St. Michael Bassishaw 'must very largely increase' less than three years hence; and at a more remote date the rents due to St. Michael, Queenhithe, 'will be very large.'

We must now turn to the question of administration, which is really the pivot of the whole matter. The people may have diminished and the money may have increased, but neither of these circumstances could justify the application of the pruning-knife or, it may be, the axe, unless it can be shown that, broadly speaking, the money is wasted, and the people whom it was designed to help injured and degraded. The indictment is not hard to draw up; the witnesses before the Royal Commissioners shall help to do it. First of all, as to the disposal of the money. In some cases the income is admittedly far more than sufficient to meet any legitimate demands upon it. The evidence from the parish of St. Alban, Wood Street, says that 'the receipts from the various gifts amount to only 30*l.*; we do not want it, but while it rests with us we do the best we can with it.' All Hallows Barking, St. Anne and St. Agnes, St. Mary Bothaw, St. Sepulchre, each possess money which is a positive encumbrance. St. Margaret, Lothbury, has a surplus of 300*l.* a year, for the disposal of which no provision whatever is made. The authorities of St. Augustine have invested in consols 2,191*l.*, 'the produce of income which has not been used,' and the accumulations of each year now reach 150*l.* In St. Mildred, Bread Street, 'the annual income of the parish charities is about 920*l.* more than we can apply to church expenses: we have 2,000*l.* accumulations.' The funds of St. Olave, Old Jewry, are 'constantly accumulating,' and even the bread gifts, usually so easily got rid of, are unclaimed. The church estate of St. Michael, Cornhill, produces 2,500*l.* per annum, for which, so long as the church is kept up in proper order, 'the parish has no real use.' The vestry of St. Mary-at-Hill have employed the excess of income over church expenses in building operations which have paid 'very well indeed.' So 'well indeed' has the experiment succeeded, that, though the parish has 20,000*l.* in the hands of the Accountant-General, it is over 5,000*l.* in debt. Its mania for buying and building had not ceased at the time of the investigation of the Royal Commission, and was still going on, heedless of the opinion of its principal parishioner: 'I do not see why parishes should be land-jobbers at all.'

The large annual income of the parochial charities finds various outlets. Something like 40,000*l.* is applied to what are known as 'Church purposes.' The question of the position of the Church in the City of London will form an interesting and astounding field for inquiry, but need only indirectly be touched upon here. In a word,

it is anomalous. Non-resident clergy, rectories and vicarages let at high rents as offices, deserted and expensively equipped churches, drowsy services, empty benches or packed congregations—this is an accurate enough picture of things as, in the main, they are. True, there exist exceptions—I am happily connected with one myself—but I am speaking broadly of the efficiency of the machinery which is supposed to galvanise the citizens of London into spiritual life. The machinery will not work, primarily perhaps because it has often no work to do. It might be better to take it to pieces and set it up somewhere else, but meanwhile it is open to doubt whether it needs so large an expenditure of oil. The sum mentioned above is not inclusive of the large clerical stipends which have made the City an ecclesiastical Paradise separated by an impassable gulf from the Gehenna of Bethnal Green. It takes in merely the odds and ends of ordinary church apparatus. Warming and ventilating and repairing, the salaries of pew-openers and other minor officials, the purchase of sacramental wine—expenses such as these, which, even in some of the most poverty-stricken quarters of the metropolis, are met by the free-will offerings of self-denying Christian people, are charged upon the ecclesiastical charities of the various parishes. There are other items of course. Organists, choirmen, lecturers, preachers of special sermons—by the way, one witness gravely defends the delivery of a religious discourse on the Spanish Armada—and general hangers-on, all help to get rid of the sum appropriated to ‘Church purposes.’

About 18,000*l.* a year is spent on the education of children within the City. Some of the schools are not under Government inspection—a fact which rather dispels confidence in the wise expenditure of the money—and the cost of the education given is on a scale at which most metropolitan ratepayers would feel aggrieved if called upon to pay for it. Still, the money devoted to education is the best spent of the charity funds of the City, and till the whole question comes up for resettlement it would be hard to find within the civic limits any worthier objects on which to employ it.

The same cannot be said for the 2,000*l.* available for the purposes of apprenticeship. Apprenticeship is practically out of date. Perhaps we have been too precipitate in letting it go before we had filled its place by a sound system of technical schools. Be that as it may, the administrators of the charities devoted to this object have not achieved any remarkable results in this direction. In the parish of St. Benet Fink there is a charity ‘for apprenticing; the surplus is invested; we have now 300*l.* in hand; there are very few applicants. There is no opportunity of apprenticing boys: there are plenty of funds, but no boys come forward.’ In St. Benet’s, Paul’s Wharf, St. Bride’s, St. Martin’s Vintry, St. Faith’s, St. Mary’s Woolnoth, the story is the same. The money is there, but no one claims it. The accumulations in St. Margaret’s, Lothbury, reached as much as 1,300*l.*

or 1,400*l.*, and were paid over to the corporation of Middle Class Education. The Drapers' Company and the Saddlers' Company, both of which hold funds intended to apprentice boys from the parish of St. Catharine, Coleman, refuse to part with the money on the ground that the conditions are not complied with. In St. Catharine Cree the unclaimed apprenticeship funds are carried to the general account of the parish charities, and in Christ Church, Newgate Street, 'the money is left in hand until there is enough to build a house on the estate' from which it is annually derived.

The considerable sum of 10,000*l.* a year is expended in a manner which in almost every case is open to question and in many instances cannot be defended at all—the payment of poor rates. There is something ludicrous in the failure of the efforts of the Royal Commissioners to convince witnesses that the appropriation of charitable funds to the reduction of the poor rate was entirely to the advantage of the rich. What, for instance, can be done with a witness like this?

5481. Handing over so large a proportion of the charities to the poor rate as you do, do not you think that it would be desirable to ascertain whether the letter of the trust allowed such a thing?—The property was left, I should presume, for the benefit of the poor, and I cannot conceive anything more lawful than to provide for the poor out of the proceeds.

5482. Does not it now go for the benefit of the rich?—No, for the benefit of the poor.

5483. Are not you bound equally to pay for the poor whether you have these charities or not?—Yes; but when we have money left for the benefit of the poor, we can apply it in no better way than to pay for the poor.

5484. Would not the poor receive the same whether these charities were left or not?—Yes.

5485. Is not it the rich who are benefited?—The poor benefit by getting the money.

Or with another like this?

5685. As regards Clarke's gift you apply that to pay poor rate?—Yes.

5686. It is left to the 'poor,' not to the poor rate?—We hope it is applied to the poor.

5687. Is not paying it to the poor rate making it a gift for the rich and not for the poor?—It goes to the relief of the large amount which we have to pay for poor rate.

5688. It goes to the relief of the rich, does it not?—It goes to the relief of the parishioners.

In some cases the practice is defended on the plea that the estate from the proceeds of which the rate is defrayed is property which in times gone by was purchased with parish money. The contention may sometimes be valid, but it is certainly often more than doubtful. To cite the words of the Royal Commissioners, some of these estates 'are stated to have been purchased by moneys raised by parochial rates; others to have been repurchased by the parishioners after having been

confiscated at the Reformation, or during the troubles of the seventeenth century. In some instances the title-deeds of the estates have disappeared, having been burnt, as it is suggested, in the Great Fire of London. Most ordinary people, it is pardonable to imagine, will endorse the recommendation that 'these statements should be submitted to closer legal investigation.' There are several cases in which the witnesses openly admit this misappropriation of funds undoubtedly designed for another purpose. The excuse is not only plausible but natural. 'The parish possesses money for which it cannot find use. The parish is rated heavily for the support of poor of whom it knows nothing and cares less. The money may as well be spent as saved. The practice has the sanction of established custom.' Perhaps so; but it is none the less unjust and immoral, and, to quote again the opinion of the Commissioners, 'should cease.'

I come now to the most harmful item of the whole expenditure—the sum of about 30,000*l.* a year disbursed in doles, gifts, pensions, and the like. And this summons up the main question whether the parochial charities of the City of London are helpful or harmful to the large mass of the people who are affected by them. To assist the poor, to relieve the destitute, to liberate the oppressed, to set on his legs again and start afresh the victim of fraud or disaster or misfortune—these are the functions and privileges of all true charity. The point is questioned by no man who is wise and sane. The difference is as to the means. The old style of alleviating distress was to scatter shillings and pay no heed to the consequences. The principle of our vicious Poor-law—at any rate of its administration—is to lend its sanction to waste, dissipation, extravagance, improvidence, by refusing State help until a man is practically beyond the need of any help, and then either to doom him and his to perpetual pauperism or to torture them by inadequate outdoor relief. The system of doles moves practically on the same lines. Their very existence encourages the presumption that thrift is imprudent. They are cruel to the old, for they are rarely of sufficient magnitude to afford the bare necessities of life: they curse the middle-aged, for they discount all efforts towards independence: they menace the highest interests of the young, for they furnish the suggestion of a profitable life of pleasant thralldom. No experience—no experience of responsible and thinking men—can adduce one testimony in their favour. They stand condemned in presence of millions of lost opportunities and deluded lives and broken hearts.

It would be too much to expect any very emphatic endorsement of this opinion among those with whom the administration of this system is associated with cherished ideas of private patronage and cheap philanthropy. Happily, however, there is a fairly strong consensus of opinion, based on the best of all reasons, in the right direction. In the parish of All Hallows Barking, 'it was found that the distribution

of doles on New Year's Day did not tend to the sobriety of the district : the money was thrown away.' In St. Botolph, Aldersgate, 'doles were an evil;' in St. Catharine Coleman they are admitted to 'pauperise the people;' in St. Lawrence, Jewry, they are 'not of much good to the poor;' in St. Mary-at-Hill they are 'doing great harm;' in St. Vedast Foster they are 'useless.' A statement by a witness from St. Peter-le-Poer suggests something wider and not less important than the moral issue involved in their debasing effects : 'The persons residing in the parish are chiefly office-keepers, and ought to be paid sufficiently by their employers.' Perhaps indeed they are, but any one who appreciates the working of the English Poor-law and the state of the labour market before 1834 may reasonably refuse to be reconciled to the possible practice of relieving wealthy merchants and bankers at the expense of the charities of the City of London. But the dole system has its apologists. Such opinions as the following are proof against the shock of logic or the testimony of fact. 'In a great many cases—in the majority of cases—the bread given away does the recipients good. The money is very well applied.' 'The charities distributed in bread and coals have been a great boon; many lives have been saved through them.' 'The present form of distribution of charity by way of doles is of great value; witness would be sorry to see it altered.' 'The small doles do good in a most marked manner by keeping up a local connection between the people who are recipients and their parish.' Ought one to sigh or smile?

There would hardly seem to be room for two opinions as to the inexpediency of requiring attendance at divine service as a qualification for receiving a few paltry loaves. Such a practice, at any rate, opens the door to the degradation of religion and the profession of hypocrisy. 'We have,' says one witness, 'a number of people who come to our church every Monday for bread; and it is a dreadful system; it makes hypocrites of them.' But another defends the custom on the ground that it brings the recipients to their religious duties on a week night! A third complacently distributes a gift 'among the poor people who come to church, especially those who receive the sacrament!'

The relation of the dole system to outdoor relief is well illustrated in the City of London. In the Poor-law division, which is identical with the civic area, it is usual to grant out-relief on what is, by comparison with some other metropolitan unions, a generous scale. Mr. Hedley, one of the Inspectors of the Local Government Board, gives it as his opinion that 'the Guardians of the City are not fully alive to the evil of a liberal administration of outdoor relief, and have not fully appreciated the benefits of applying the workhouse test in cases of alleged destitution.' Perhaps the cause may be found in the fact that the enormous rateable value of the City makes the incidence of taxation to be rarely oppressive, and provides thus easily a large

revenue which it is very tempting to dispense with freedom and even munificence. Bearing in mind all along that the doles distributed among the City poor amount to more than 30,000*l.* a year, it is noticeable that the ratio of outdoor to indoor relief is in the City of London Union as 1.1 to 1, a test which places it in a worse position than 19 and in a better than 10 of the other Unions within the metropolitan area; that the ratio of paupers to population in the City is 1 in 16, a proportion which for London generally is 1 in 37 and for the Union of Whitechapel only 1 in 51; that the annual cost of out-relief per head of population is for the City 4*s.* 4½*d.*, while for one other Union it is between 3*s.* and 4*s.*, for another 2*s.*, for 12 others between 1*s.* and 2*s.*, and for 15 under 1*s.*

Doles, then, do not diminish pauperism: it seems a fair inference that they aggravate it. Nor is this matter of surprise when it is admitted that, in many instances, persons in the receipt of parish relief, and even inmates of the workhouse, have participated in these distributions of charitable gifts. Rarely could the Royal Commissioners find, on the part of trustees or poor-law officials, any practical endeavour to prevent the overlapping of two forms of relief, which ought to differ widely in their administration and effects. It is a mere chance whether a recipient is not being played upon by two distinct forces with the obvious result of perverting charity and vitiating the Poor-law. One responsible witness did not know even the name of the relieving officer! So lax, indeed, is the administration that the Commissioners are able to report that 'it is perfectly possible that the same individual may be a recipient of charitable gifts in more than one parish.' The evidence of fact further justifies the statement that he may also be receiving a very comfortable measure of out-relief from the guardians.

So far I have said nothing of those eccentricities of expenditure which lend such a picturesque variety to the disbursement of the City parochial charities. And yet I must not pass them over, for they greatly help to make out a case for reform. Take, for instance, the practice of paying parish officials an undue proportion of their salaries for parochial services out of charitable funds. The obvious consequence is the relief of the ratepayers who ought to pay their officers adequately, and the perversion of money intended for the benefit of the poor to purposes quite alien. It is hardly surprising that the Report recommends that this 'should at once cease.' Nor can a better defence be offered for charging upon charity moneys the cost of convivial entertainments. Drinking sherry and saying prayers do not quite harmonise, and yet more than one witness passionately pleads for the retention of the ancient custom of providing wine before and after divine service for the clergy and churchwardens and whomsoever they bid to join them in their potations. One parish employs eight wine merchants! Another spent 71*l.* 2*s.* 6*d.* on

'visiting the tombs;' another 166*l.* 7*s.* 10*d.* on the 'hospitalities' of a single year: a third expended 74*l.* 11*s.* 6*d.* in a dinner at the 'Ship,' Greenwich, 'pursuant to a resolution of the vestry;' 'supplies for the church and sundries,' amounting to 108*l.* 0*s.* 4*d.*, comprehensively includes 'a parishioners' Easter dinner.' Again, 'it was thought it would promote good feeling between the rector and parishioners if they went to the Crystal Palace and had a dinner: it cost 38*l.*' And so on and so on, though it is worth recording that in the parish of St. Vedast Foster 'from time immemorial there has been a pint of wine placed in the vestry every Sunday,' which happens to be port of a vintage chosen by the sexton, who is good enough to oblige the rector by drinking it.

There is another catalogue of funds misapplied to the purposes of granting testimonials to acceptable clergy and churchwardens; another of charitable bequests united with current parish accounts; a third of disproportionate payments and diversions of trusts; a fourth of sums lumped vaguely under the head of 'other expenses.' Some instances of increases in the income of property not proportionately applied to the original purposes of the foundation have already received the grave censure of the Charity Commissioners. In most cases there is no adequate system of auditing the accounts. 'Large balances are at times held by the churchwardens: in some cases no banking accounts have been kept, and moneys belonging to the parish have, in other instances, not been forthcoming when called for.' Further, the Commissioners 'cannot but remark on the number and amount of the undetailed items in the accounts submitted to the Charity Commissioners.' Some charities are lost: others are in abeyance.

Even less satisfactory is the plan of administration. Practically, the clergy and churchwardens have the exercise of a huge system of private patronage. The vestry meeting is often a farce. Twelve is in many parishes a large attendance: in some it sinks to three or four: in St. Botolph, Aldersgate, the 'recipients of the charities do not feel themselves disqualified from attending.'

I might prolong, but I could hardly strengthen, this indictment. Confusion, recklessness, defiance of all considerations of political economy, in a word, chaos reigns, with one or two exceptions, through every one of these parishes. The story cannot bear the light of day, for it has to tell of money which might, wisely applied on a wider area, change the face of a neighbourhood or of a generation, frittered away and wasted. It has to tell, too, of poverty encouraged, pauperism generated, independence stifled, hypocrisy sanctioned.

What, then, is to be the remedy? I will try to indicate a part of it.

1. Obviously the first thing to be done is to institute a more searching investigation than was possible to be made by the recent Royal Commission. The members of that body unanimously report

that they have been unable to undertake 'an examination into the original deeds and charters of the charities, and to determine what portion of the funds held by each of the several parishes is properly applicable to the purposes for which they are now used, and what portion ought to be otherwise used and administered.' 'To do so effectually,' they continue, 'within a reasonable time will necessitate the employment of their whole time and attention by those who shall be entrusted with this inquiry, besides the qualification on the part of one at least of their number of considerable legal knowledge of a technical character.' There is, therefore, recommended the appointment of a temporary commission empowered to examine into the trusts, charters, deeds, and documents, in any way pertaining to the City charities, or to their administration; 'into the leases granted by the trustees and the employment of the revenue; and to examine into their accounts for the last seven years past.' It will be for Parliament to use its wisdom as to the amount of authority to be entrusted to this Executive Commission. The work before it will involve very great interests, and demands men of weight and power. No less than thirty-five parishes, for instance, claim to hold estates free from any trust and secured to them by all the sanctions which confirm private persons in the possession of their property. In other cases no title-deeds at all are forthcoming, or the origin of the funds is quite unknown. There arises, too, the wide and difficult question of classification. The charities may be grouped generally under the headings of eleemosynary and ecclesiastical, but the line of distinction has often been drawn, to the advantage of one side or the other, in obedience to other motives than those of equity. There must be no instructions to presume in favour of either alternative, and in this matter the Royal Commissioners have not appreciated either the temper of the age or the probable action of the Legislature. The work of a strong and just Executive Commission would be much weakened by an injunction that ecclesiastical charities were to include not only those funds which by the terms of their existence were applicable only to church purposes, 'but also such as have been for a long period of years applied to such uses, though not specifically enjoined by the will of the founder.' Three of the seven members of the Royal Commission have placed on record their dissent from this proposition, and the Rev. W. Rogers, Rector of Bishopsgate, has thus succinctly stated the objection of Sir Farrer Herschell and Mr. Albert Pell, as well as of himself:—

It appears to me that the funds here spoken of have been applied to parochial purposes, and that the gradual disappearance and diminution of other parochial objects has caused the parish church to occupy a very prominent place in the schemes of distribution; but that they are still parochial funds and not church funds, and that in each case their proper application ought to be an open question to be decided on consideration of all the circumstances, as in any other case of failure of objects.

There ought not to be any reason why a classification on broad, liberal, and just grounds should fail to give satisfaction. It is not a matter to wrangle about, and both sides must be prepared to accept equitable decisions given in the spirit of true compromise. Meanwhile there must be a fair field and no favour.

2. The duties of such an Executive Commission as is recommended will not admit of hurry. Perhaps a limitation of two years would not be an extravagant allowance for the work. But there seems no good reason why in the interval things shall be allowed to get worse. To draw a precedent from a much greater, though not more necessary, reform, a measure is wanted for suspending the creation of fresh vested interests. Perhaps a few people may be injured, and more are sure to be disappointed. It always is so, and it always must be so. But in this case, as in others, the end will justify the means. Some old folk may have to close their days in the workhouse instead of succeeding to the doles of some dead neighbour; the assistant to some clerk of a trust must go without the shoes for which he has been so patiently waiting; a prospective churchwarden must be content with a diminished and still diminishing patronage. It is irritating, no doubt, but vested interests in a threatened institution crop up like mushrooms in a night. The sanction of Parliament might reasonably be extended to an enactment decreeing that from a certain date—the day, say, of the introduction of the measure—no new interests should be created in any shape or form. Exception would of course be made in favour of schemes for which application had already been made to the Charity Commissioners, and it would not, I apprehend, be difficult to arrange for temporarily filling up vacancies in the management of any trust.

3. Another movement towards order might be similarly proceeding. At present the trusts of the various charities are 1,330 in number. That many of them are models of management it is impossible to deny; it is equally true that the reverse is sometimes the case. But the issue I would raise is of another kind, and suggests the unadvisability, on economical and economic grounds, of permitting corporations to be possessors of such a large and varied amount of real estate. It is the opinion of Sir Charles Trevelyan, than whom no one has better right to speak on this subject, that the parochial charities of the City, if properly realised and placed in the public funds, would produce treble their present annual value. I cannot do better than quote fully from his evidence:—

The bequests represent every variety of private property, such as houses, cottages, stables, gardens, workshops, warehouses, wharves, and country farms. Shares in houses was one of the commonest forms of bequests. . . . Property of this description is with difficulty made the most of, even by the thrift and close personal attention of individual proprietors, prompted by the strongest interested motives. What, therefore, is to be expected from the action of the ephemeral churchwardens of phantom parishes, who are neither stimulated nor checked by

local public opinion? Waste, deterioration, and total loss constantly come to the surface in the records of these charities. . . . For this broken-down, wasteful, demoralising state of things there is only one remedy: to convert the whole of the City parochial estates into private property by selling them to the highest bidder, and to invest the proceeds in the funds.

And again on the economic aspect of the case:—

The best result of all would be the process of reconstruction and improvement upon which these neglected estates would enter. For attracting the investment of private capital, for encouraging industry, for increasing production, and for maintaining our population in a contented, moral, and hopeful state, there is nothing like the magic of private proprietorship.

In a word, then, what is wanted is *capitalisation*. This might begin at once and proceed as, by the falling in of leases and so on, occasion offered. The process would be gradual, but the question would have been advantageously simplified and cleared.

I will allude but briefly to the recommendations of the Royal Commission. That they were ever intended to be carried out—at any rate, that they were ever considered likely to be carried out—is hard to think. The Report wants firmness. It reads haltingly. There is an unhealthy straining after one end. It condemns, it is true, decisively enough the existing state of affairs, but there crops up all through a tenderness of compassion which the evidence certainly does not justify. The Commissioners might have spared themselves the assurance that they had been actuated by the desire to perform their work ‘with as little disturbance of existing ideas and interests as is consistent with the effectual discharge of the duty imposed’ upon them. Nothing, to take an example, could be less likely to commend itself to public confidence than the suggested constitution of the Board which is to administer for the benefit of London generally such eleemosynary funds as may remain over after the wants of the City have been supplied. Fifteen members are to be chosen from the representatives of the City parishes, and two from the Common Council. The Metropolitan Asylums Board and the Metropolitan Board of Works are each to send two more, and there are to be four co-optative members. The one answer to such an arrangement as this, or to anything in any way approaching it, is that the right of the City to control these charities is not admitted. They belong, by all considerations of justice, to London and to Londoners. A prolonged and anomalous possession enables the City to raise claims which must be fairly met; but, that done, it is almost ludicrous to suggest that the charitable and philanthropic interests of the rest of the metropolis are to be governed in this matter by a packed Board.

If the parochial charities of the City are to be rescued from their present pernicious and useless purposes, and applied to the real benefit of the metropolitan poor, the rearrangement must be made on bold and enlightened lines. Charity is becoming a system if not a

science. Men are beginning to see that the old methods of helping the poor often effected precisely opposite results, and that the truest kindness which the rich and benevolent can do to them is to help them to help themselves. The other plan has had its trial. For three centuries already the English Poor Law has oppressed the English poor as no other institution has ever weighed down upon any other class. It has, moreover, given the cue to that reckless, indiscriminate, inadequate charity which is only a refined form of cruelty. We are coming, it is to be hoped, upon days when the wealthy, taught by the lessons of the past, will direct their money to the removal of organic and radical defects in the condition of the poor, and when the poor will appreciate the truth that doles and gifts and casual unearned relief constitute little less than a curse and a blight. And so these charities cannot be allowed to become more injurious than now they are by being scheduled, codified, arranged for purposes which a few years hence will be almost universally recognised as disastrous. The Royal Commissioners would have done well to adopt the emphatic memorandum which was offered to them by Mr. Pell, who could speak in this matter from a wide measure of experience gained as a Guardian of the Poor in an East-end Union. He suggested that 'the fund should be so applied as to encourage any legitimate effort which the poorer classes may be themselves now or hereafter making to meet the wants and attain the objects which the founders of these charities had in view, when these may be in harmony with the conditions of society in modern times. In other words, that provident institutions supported by the poorer classes shall have the first claim on the fund.'

These words strike the keynote of the only possible solution. Let Parliament lay down the broad principle here involved, and assign to a strong representative Board, composed of members practically acquainted with the poor quarters of the whole metropolis, full liberty to carry it into action. Let the ecclesiastical funds be similarly accessible to the starving parishes of the diocese. Let these charities come to be recognised as the property of the living and not of the dead, as meant to bless and not to curse. The lot of the poor of London is hard enough; there is here a chance of giving to it wise and permanent relief.

R. H. HADDEN.

A JEWISH VIEW OF THE ANTI-JEWISH AGITATION.

Thou hast spoken of the Jew as the persecution of such as thou art has made him. Heaven in ire has driven him from his country, but industry has opened to him the only road to power and to influence which oppression has left unbarred. Read the ancient history of the people of God, and tell me if those, by whom Jehovah wrought such marvels among the nations, were then a people of misers and usurers!—And know, proud knight, we number names amongst us to which your boasted northern nobility is as the gourd compared with the cedar—names that ascend far back to those high times when the Divine Presence shook the mercy-seat between the cherubim, and which derive their splendour from no earthly prince, but from the awful Voice, which bade their fathers be nearest of the congregation to the Vision. Such *were* the princes of Judah, now such no more!—~~Yet there~~ are those among them who shame not such high descent. I envy not thy blood-won honours! I envy not thy barbarous descent from northern heathens! I envy thee not thy faith, which is ever in thy mouth, but never in thy heart nor in thy practice.—SIR WALTER SCOTT, *Ivanhoe*.

Sind Christ und Jude eher Christ und Jude
Als Mensch?—LESSING, *Nathan der Weise*.

THE wave of anti-Jewish agitation which is now sweeping across almost the entire world, and which has reached its fiercest and most significant torrents in Germany, is not so phenomenal as most people think, although it certainly derives an aspect of some importance from the apparently paradoxical circumstances of its appearance. It is probably the last time that we shall witness the surgings and swellings of this hoary visitation in any remarkable prominence; for this is the first occasion upon which its current has been at all impeded, and it has found itself impotently splashing against an adequate breakwater—the breakwater of a highly educated and vigorous liberalism. To my mind, indeed, it is almost a subject of congratulation that this agitation has reappeared so soon after the emancipation of my people, in dimensions sufficient to attract the consideration of the thinking world and to evoke the protests of the most cultured and highly venerated amongst us. What Dean Milman calls the ‘iron age of Judaism’ has now endured for more than a thousand years. Consecrated by *soi-disant* holy records and countenanced by secular traditions, nursed into a

monstrous adolescence by legend, and vulgarised by fable, the hatred of the Jew has grown and grown until its indoctrination has ranged from the *dicta* of popes and emperors to the refrains of nursery lullabies. Can it be wondered at then that this passion has entered deeply into the natures of the dominant races of the world? Its resuscitation at this moment, when it is generally considered that civil and religious liberty is not a mere theory, but an established and indispensable keystone in all well-ordered politics, is a sufficient proof that its complete eradication is a work of very slow development. Hitherto it has luxuriated in congenial surroundings, and its outbursts have been, if not quite unchecked, at least comparatively successful. When the last violent ebullition of anti-Jewish prejudices took place, just sixty years ago, the state of things in Europe was, as far as the moral receptiveness of all classes of society was concerned, very different from that of the present day. The autocracies were then in the ascendant, and the excesses of the French Revolution had discredited those dreams of popular freedom and of religious liberty which have reached a certain degree of realisation in our own times. Under these circumstances the existence of a class burdened with disabilities was no inconsistency, and their occasional persecutions no anomaly. Since then the political changes which have been effected are enormous, and in theory at least the equality of all classes has been fully established. Still, however, the hatred of the Jew has continued to lurk illogically amongst the primary passions of non-Jewish nature, and now, but shortly after our emancipation, it has broken out in much of its ancient violence.

There can be no doubt, however, that it has this time been effectually checked. In its first reappearance but a vulgar revival of mediæval prejudice, it was sternly met by the simple but irrefutable rebukes of modern philosophy. Since then its changes of front, in the endeavour to assert itself successfully, have been beyond number, and if it has attempted, as it certainly has, to vindicate itself on philosophic principles, it is a sign of its weakness, as it clearly shows the nature and strength of the weapons with which it has had to cope. Can there, then, be any doubt as to the result of this conflict between the unanswerable propositions of modern liberalism and the casuistical justifications of an anachronistic prejudice? It must end in the well-merited disgrace and degradation of the latter, and thus one of the most important works of the age will be largely proceeded with. Its complete success cannot of course be immediate, but, once branded with despicable failure, another generation will be slow to receive its tarnished traditions, and then gradually its paroxysms must weaken and weaken until they die away altogether. It is for this reason that I regard the latest outbreak of anti-Semitism with a species of *cœur léger*; and I must confess that I do not approach an investigation of its history, its arguments, and its aims, with any

of those dire forebodings which have characterised so many other disquisitions on the subject which I have had the advantage of perusing.

If this latest revival of Judeophobia is not infelicitous in its appearance amongst a people through long ages addicted to a display of passion in this direction, it is certainly deserving of attention on account of its not being confined to one country. The effervescence of a certain feeling against the Jews is apparent in almost all the large states of the world, with the single exception perhaps of France. Eastern Christianity, which Mr. Gladstone has ventured to characterise as carrying the torch of civilisation in the Orient, has signalised itself, for some time past, in outrages upon the Jews, before which the excesses of Batak may be relegated to a category of comparative humanity. The 'fiery cross' has been adopted by the smaller Mohammedan States, and has left a smoking trail over the whole of the southern littoral of the Mediterranean; even in Italy, where so many Israelites occupy positions of prominence and responsibility, ugly rumours, quasi-justified by a certain deafness to the sufferings of the Roumanian Jews, have been heard of high personages cherishing a prejudice against the Jews; in America the 'Boycotting' of Jews is a common occurrence, and in this country we have been recently told that the agitation which was commenced by Professor Goldwin Smith, and continued by some of the lights of the Liberal party, is only slumbering until other more pressing affairs shall have been disposed of.

And yet, strange to say, there is nothing even in the latest phases of this agitation to commend it to that high standard of intelligence which is accepted as the spirit of the age. The involved and often contradictory arguments in its favour which are now so numerous put forward did not generate the present agitation, but were really generated by it under the pressure of being forced to adopt a programme capable of whitewashing it into the required degree of respectability. It broke out in precisely the same way as it has always broken out before. The hatred of the Jew by the Christian has become, as I have already pointed out, one of those acquired habits which proverbial philosophy teaches us are as secondary instincts. In normal passions there is a community of feeling which embraces all ages, from the darkest to the present day, and amongst these passions Judeophobia has long been ranked. In our present development of intellectual strength, these passions do little more than balance the relatively enlightened sentiments which we evolve from a calm and educated appreciation of equitable law; but let this equilibrium be once disturbed, and they immediately rise into the ascendant. Thus when the holy aspirations of the Crusades degenerated into vulgar fanaticism, the Jews were persecuted; when the balance of mind and passion was disturbed by the appearance of the Black Death, the

primary prejudices of Christians associated the Jews with their visitation, and their wholesale massacre became inevitable; in 1820, Germany found itself groaning under fearful burdens, and when in their despair their fretful eyes by chance alighted upon a few Jews who had managed to amass wealth, the Germans gave vent to all their grievances in one mighty outburst of their most congenial prejudice. See too how, in this country, when party feeling reached the highest pitch it has ever reached in English history, the Hebrew extraction of the then Prime Minister was sufficient to induce a host of writers and speakers to vent all their party spleen on the Jewish race. Similar circumstances have generated the present agitation. Germany has, during the last ten years, fallen from the position of one of the richest and happiest, to one of the poorest and most disturbed of states. Bowed down beneath the intolerable burden of an immense standing army, and distracted by failing trade and intense political conflict, the country has presented a melancholy appearance, and consequently the Jews have become the scapegoats of all the popular discontent. The vague and illogical murmurs of the people have been taken up by all extremes of political opinion; and Socialists and Conservatives, Protestants and Catholics, have alike found in Judeophobia an identity with their own interests. This fact alone is sufficient to show the blindly instinctive—as distinct from the intelligently deliberate—nature of the agitation, and it is therefore hardly likely that it will survive in its integrity the inevitable return to calm, honourable, and immortal principles.

Before, however, I examine the most noteworthy amongst the arguments of the anti-Semites, it may be desirable that I should briefly sketch the history of the recent outbreak, in illustration of my theory of the inherent nature of the prejudice which has brought it about.

During the late Russo-Turkish war the Jews all over the world were loud in their condemnation of what they, in common with a large number of their countrymen, regarded as the hypocritical designs of Russia. Carried away by the heat of party conflict, which then ran phenomenally high, many of them even ventured to appear at public meetings and to express the tendency of their opinions with the courage and outspokenness of citizens and patriots. Political differences rapidly fermented until they reached the highest point of violence, and then, boiling over, they degenerated into vindictive personalities and low abuse. This was the opportunity for signalling themselves required by the more narrow-minded of the opponents of the national programmes in England and Hungary. In this country Sir Tollemache Sinclair, and in the Cisleithan kingdom an individual named Istoczy, seized with avidity upon the theme, and, having discovered that Lord Beaconsfield was of Hebrew parentage, and that Jews generally supported the Russophobic

policy, they abandoned the more complex problems of the Eastern question—to the solution of which they had not been able to contribute anything—for the more simple outcry that the Jews were at the bottom of all the mischiefs of which they complained. At that moment the German people were, by a combination of the elements of depression, particularly susceptible to an attack of Judeophobia; the contagion was not slow to reach them, and it soon became apparent that the vague murmurs of the multitude, which were speedily heard, only required some directing and organising agency to give them more than ordinary point and effect.

Singularly appropriate was the anti-Semites' first choice of a leader. This was made in the person of one Wilhelm Marr, an obscure German journalist, who appeared to hold sufficiently gloomy views on the Jewish question to recommend him to the public, and these he very soon embodied in a pamphlet which he entitled *Der Sieg des Judenthums über das Germanenthum*.

In this work the author mournfully and lugubriously exclaimed that Germany was becoming thoroughly Judaised. He explained that the Jews were gradually ousting native Germans from every post of value and importance in the country, and that, by their remarkable discipline as a class, their rapid multiplication, and their demoralising avocations, they were in a fair way, if not to exterminate the Teuton race altogether, at least to subjugate it. To such a pitch of despair did Herr Marr work himself in this unique literary production that he concluded with this very distressing peroration:—‘A voice in the desert has been raised, and has stated facts—undeniable facts. Let us accommodate ourselves to the inevitable, if we cannot remedy it. *Vae victis, finis Germaniæ!*’ There was, however, some method in Herr Marr’s melancholia. Notwithstanding the cheerless view of the prospects of his fatherland which he took in the body of his pamphlet, in a short prefatory address to his readers he suddenly brightened up, and called upon his countrymen to join with him in preventing the consummation of the Hebrew conspiracy which he had discovered, *by founding a social and political weekly newspaper, to be edited by himself*.

Unfortunately, everything was so ripe for an outbreak of Judeophobia that the German public did not trouble itself to inquire into Herr Marr’s motives. It read his brochure with avidity, and within a few days six editions were exhausted. The Ultramontane and Conservative organs eagerly seized upon the theory promulgated by Marr; the former accepting it as a novel form of an old and cherished polemical whetstone, the latter recognising in it a plausible basis on which to avenge all the wrongs which an impoverished and intolerant *Junkerthum* attributed to the Jews. Diatribe after diatribe was launched from the columns of such representative prints as the *Germania*, the *Vaterland*, the *Reichsbote*, and the

Kreuz-Zeitung, and gradually Herr Marr's theory became exaggerated, until, under the name of 'International Semitism,' it was proclaimed that the danger extended to the whole of the civilised world.

Marr then published a second pamphlet, called *Der Weg zum Siege des Germanenthums über das Judenthum*, in which, whilst advocating a great national anti-Jewish movement, he also endeavoured to prove that the commercial avocations of the Jews were and always had been a standing menace and danger to the people amongst whom they dwelt. Real work, he told his readers, the Jews would not undertake, preferring always those dark byways of *Schachern und Wuchern*, which were the 'sole reasons that they had always been hated from the beginning of history.' A number of other pamphleteers followed in the same strain, the most notable being *Die Judenfrage*, by Waldegg, *Neupalästina, Wo steckt der Mauschel?* by Reymond, *Vorurtheil oder berechtigter Hass?* by von Wedell, and *Minister Maybach und der Giftbaum*, by Naudh. The patriotism of the Jews was also attacked by Rubens, Rohling, and Todt, with casuistical analyses of Rabbinical Judaism, and then suddenly the so-called economical aspects of the agitation attracted the attention of the Rev. Herz Stöcker, one of the court chaplains, and a pillar of communistic socialism.

This impulsive ecclesiastic, having founded an association called the Christian Social Working-man's Party, intended to work wonders in the way of ameliorating the condition of the German working-man, commenced to lecture on the Jewish question before his rough disciples 'with a ferocious energy,' to quote the words of the Berlin correspondent of the *Times*, 'which would have endeared him to the soul of Martin Luther and of John Knox.' He revived all the charges which had fruitlessly been brought against the Jews five years before by the *Kreuz-Zeitung*, preaching that they were the authors of a new caste and of a new source of social oppression, and that they were endeavouring to create amongst themselves not only an aristocracy of finance, but also a dangerous autocracy of capital. The prevailing depression in commerce and agriculture recommended these views to the most sensitive sympathies of the German working classes. The belief rapidly spread that all the miseries from which Germans were suffering were really due to the unholy accumulations of the Jews, and, as a consequence, the popular excitement ran so high that on the occasion of a Jewish festival one or two personal attacks upon Hebrews were chronicled by the papers. The excitement increased; vague advertisements appeared in the Berlin and Dresden newspapers calling upon the opponents of Judaisation to send their names to certain addresses, and at last, about eighteen months ago, a number of anti-Semite leagues were announced, with head-quarters in the two great centres of German Protestantism and

Catholicism. The following is a translation of the first statutes of these leagues adopted by the members :—

1. The object of the Anti-Semite League, founded by non-Jews, is to unite all non-Jewish Germans of all persuasions, all parties, all stations, into one common league, which, setting aside all separate interests, all political differences, shall strive, with all earnestness and diligence, for the one end, viz., to save our German fatherland from becoming completely Judaised, and render residence in it supportable to the posterity of its aborigines.

2. This object is to be striven after in a strictly legal way, by resisting with all lawful means the further supplanting of Germanism by Judaism, by making it its task to thrust the Semites back into a station corresponding to their numerical strength; by delivering the Germans from the oppression of Jewish influence weighing down upon them in the social, political, and ecclesiastical spheres, and securing to the children of Germans their full right to offices and dignities in the German fatherland.

3. To attain this object the League avails itself of the following means: (a) Granting aid to its members and to other societies having the same tendency in the shape of money, lectures, communications, itinerant teachers, libraries, by the press, etc., and by favouring non-Jewish competitors in all spheres and stations of life. (b) Public and private agitation for the removal of Jewish preponderance in the administration of the community and the State, in the legislature, and society, by instruction, by aiding aspiring young talent, by education and scholarships, by rescuing unfortunate victims from the hands of the usurers, etc. (c) Opposing the Jewish press by aiding and starting non-Jewish journals; and finally (d), by forming exclusive circles, clubs, and the like, to which Jews are not admitted.

4. The symbol of the League, combining religious faith with the fatherland (*sic*) [meaning, of course, the love of the fatherland or patriotism], is the cross resting on an oak-leaf. This circumstance alone proves that the League is by no means aggressive. All violence, all baiting (*Hetze*) is foreign to it.¹ Politics are excluded from all the meetings of the League.

5. The members are divided into 'called' and 'chosen' ones.

6. Every respectable non-Jewish man of twenty-four years of age, able to read and write, and offering guarantees that he joins the League for the sake of its objects, not from mere curiosity or impure motives, can become a 'called' member. Exceptionally, men under twenty-four may be admitted too.

7. The candidate has to apply in writing to the office of the League, to send in his photograph, furnished with his name in his own hand, and must be able to refer to two 'called' ones, or one 'chosen' member. On his being admitted, his photograph, furnished with the stamp of the League, will be returned, and the symbol of the League handed to him. The two will serve him at meetings or in conferences with an individual member as his legitimation.

8. Each member has to pay an admission fee of three marks, one mark for the symbol, and fifty pfennings for the bye-laws. Also a monthly contribution of one mark has to be paid to the office of the League. Larger contributions are permitted.

9. Every member is fully entitled to aid on the part of the League, so far as its objects are concerned, and is, on the other hand, in duty bound to promote them to the best of his abilities. On matters of the League the members have to observe the strictest secrecy towards non-members.

¹ In more than one detail the agitation of the Anti-Semite League bears a resemblance to that of the Irish Land League. Both ostentatiously parade their disapproval of personal violence, and yet all the outrages which have taken place within the area of their influence are directly traceable to their encouragement.

These statutes afford an excellent insight into the nature of the anti-Semite leagues and of the feelings which brought about their establishment. They had not been long promulgated when the agitation received a powerful auxiliary in the person of Professor von Treitschke, a distinguished *littérateur*, and a personal friend of Prince Bismarck. In the course of an article on the Jewish question in the Prussian *Jahrbücher*, a monthly magazine edited by him, he enlarged upon its ethnological aspects. After a very fanciful account of how the Jews were crowding into Germany, he laid it down as pre-eminently dangerous to German independence, that a hardy race, more or less nomad in character, should invade the fatherland in such numbers, and, being charged in a higher degree than the Teutons with virile energy, should, in one generation or another, gather to themselves the greatest prizes in the country without holding out any prospect of eventually returning them to the natives by intermarriage, or without ensuring that they should not be carried from the country. Since then the agitation has grown to bloated proportions, and I am assured that 100,000 is a modest figure at which to estimate the number of definitely affiliated members of the leagues. The leagues themselves have spread even into Hungary, and, notwithstanding protests from the highest and most intellectual quarters, neither leaders nor members have been deterred from continuing their zealous propaganda, which is already not insignificantly stained with blood. This is briefly the history of the agitation in Germany; its recent developments are too familiar to everyone to need any detailed description at my hands.

That this account of the inception and progress of anti-Semitism in Germany bears out my theory of the commonplace character of the agitation will not, I think, be easily denied. It came from the unreasoning multitude exactly in the same way as its historical prototypes always sprung into existence; its leaders were at the commencement below mediocrity, and now it has not more than half-a-dozen well-known names connected with it. Somewhat of a comic aspect is, too, imparted to it by the Titanic exertions of its incompetent chiefs to supply it with a rational gospel. The blunders they made were terrible, and only a week or two ago I was amused to read in the *Jüdische Literaturblatt* an article in which it was shown how inappropriate was even the very name of the agitation. Quoting Delitzsch, the writer pointed out how Shem (from which name the word *Semite* is, as everyone knows, derived), the son of Noah, was exalted above his brothers in his father's prophecies, and that, in accordance with these prophecies, as well as the literal meaning of the word '*Shem*,' '*Semitism*' should mean '*Godliness*.' It will, therefore, be apparent that, in calling themselves '*anti-Semites*,' Herr Marr's disciples have fallen into a ridiculous error. This little incident is a pregnant argument in favour of my theory of the wholly

irrational character of the agitation. It would not have been in harmony with the profound and scientific nature of modern thought to have revived what Oliver Wendell Holmes would call the 'polarisation' of the word 'Jew.' It had been so synonymous with benighted mediævalism; it was the word which had lit the fires of the Inquisition, and upon which the Flagellants had called down fanatical curses during the Black Death. 'Down with the Jews!' had been the cry of the ignorant mob five hundred years before; to revive it now would have been to raise with it its own condemnation. What, then, did they do? They were not very distinguished scholars—probably they will point out, if they are sufficiently well acquainted with history, that all the apostles of great theological movements have been humble individuals—and therefore, with that craving for long words which characterises the ignorant, they seem to have referred to some book of synonyms, and, having discovered a term which was capable of an ending in '-ism,' and the derivation of which was, as far as they were concerned, obscure, they adopted it as calculated to invest their agitation with a certain novelty, and a claim to cultured consideration. The arguments of the Anti-Semites have been invented in precisely the same manner, and, as I will now show, they have been equally ridiculously misapplied.

The object of these arguments is to show that Anti-Semitism is a secular movement quite distinct from the *Judenhetze* of other times, perfectly free of religious prejudice and growing out of a combination of circumstances entirely of modern development. This interpretation of the movement has been put forward over and over again with painful accentuation, and it is no doubt in the hope of its 'immortal truth' outliving base and calumnious misconstruction that the Anti-Semites stick so tenaciously to their agitation. The movement has been condemned by the flower of German learning and intelligence; it is said to be in conflict with the most glorious traditions of German literature, to be dragging in the dirt the immortal teachings of Lessing, to be falsifying the fervently expressed hope of Goethe that his countrymen would never forget 'the divine lessons' of *Nathan der Weise*; but to all this the Anti-Semites have opposed the stolid declaration that their cause is rational and intelligible, and that it is perfectly innocent of the *odium theologicum*. It is difficult, however, to believe this, even without being acquainted with the history of the agitation. If the Jews have certain evil qualities, why not aim at counteracting the exercise of these bad qualities, instead of broadly anathematising an entire people? It is too ridiculous a proposition to put forward that *all* Jews are unscrupulous and unpatriotic. If the common law of Germany be not strong enough to deal with dishonesty and conspiracy, by all means let leagues be formed to counteract them; but why assume to 'Boycott' an entire class in order to reach this comparatively small end?

And then, why should the Jews be mentioned by their social and theological name if the logical outcome of the agitation is not that if they will only conform to the prevailing type of Christianity all their criminality will be at an end? And, strange to say, onlookers are not left to arrive at this interpretation of the object of the movement without some explicit assistance from the Anti-Semites themselves. In the same breath that the Jews are told that they are steeped in crime, and dangerous to the commonwealth, they are informed that the best way to improve themselves is to marry Christians, and merge themselves into the German nation. It is very extraordinary to me that such stern moralists can view so dreadful a contamination with equanimity; this is, however, one of those very interesting points where the new-born arguments of the Anti-Semites are crossed by the aspirations of mediæval fanaticism. ‘Dog of a Jew!’ thundered the Grand Inquisitor to the Hebrew trembling at the stake, ‘you have inherited the responsibilities of the crucifiers of Christ: but confess your sins and embrace this holy cross, and all will be forgiven.’ The Anti-Semites are—at least so they say—not at all animated by this ancient fanaticism; it is, of course, a very different thing when they say ‘Semites! in your present position you must be, by all ethnological, economical, and philosophic rule, a danger to the countries in which you dwell. We are consequently compelled, as discriminating philanthropists, to exclude you from an equality with your fellow-citizens, unless, of course, you consent to give up your theological and social characteristics, and to lose your moral obliquity in the infinity of our virtue.’ There are some people who will say that they cannot see the difference between these two renderings of Judeophobia, and I must confess that I am one of them. Put it how they will, Anti-Semitism is after all as bitter a theological agitation as the Jew-hating of the Middle Ages, and it is as deeply tinged with the proselytising mania.

These arguments, however, form so admirable an opportunity for the demolition of at least one very unjust prejudice with respect to the Jews, that I will not shirk their consideration because of their assumed basis having no real existence in fact.

In the first place let me examine the most popular argument, viz., that by their depraved avocations—particularly usury—the Jews are an important factor in the demoralisation of any country in which they live. ‘The Jews hate real work,’ says Marr in one of his pamphlets, ‘*Sie sind hochtalentirt zum Realismus*, and are therefore inherently only money-grubbers.’ Reymond harps upon the same theme. ‘The Semitic character,’ he says, ‘is the antithesis of all ideality; in the commercial as well as in the domestic life of the Jews, the prevailing influence is selfishness.’ ‘The Jew will not do any hard or honourable work,’ says Waldegg in *Die Judenfrage*; ‘who

ever heard of a Jewish locksmith, blacksmith, builder, or miner ? ' And they all concur in the conclusion that it is for this reason that Jews are, and always will be, hungry and unscrupulous usurers. Popular as is this idea, I must confess that I am rather astonished that it should be soberly put forward, in vindication of what is supposed to be a philosophic and thoughtful attack upon Jews. I think it was Lord John Russell who, in a speech on the Jewish emancipation question, said, that Christians generally should welcome a measure intended to mete out justice to a people on whom they had inflicted so much wrong ; and yet now, not half a century after our emancipation, we are credited with vices entirely due to nearly fifteen centuries of Christian persecution. The Anti-Semites invoke history to their aid ; but, as with all their invocations and arguments, it is only to be hoist with their own petard.

In the early Biblical times the Jews, so far from being money-grubbers, were a romantically Arcadian people. In the highest degree poetical in all their ideas, they knew no other occupation than agriculture, and there are but few Jewish laws relating to earning one's living which are not based on the assumption that agriculture would always be the principal interest to be catered for. During their Egyptian slavery the Jews *had* to do hard work, if ever a people had, and on their entrance to the land of Canaan they had to fight stoutly and bravely. In Palestine their occupations were principally in the field and vineyard, and about the time of Jesus they began to devote some attention to industry, there being every proof, according to Gesenius, that they were proficient as potters, weavers, furriers, rope-makers, goldsmiths, basket-makers, soap-boilers, engravers, pewterers, builders, stonemasons, miners, coppersmiths, cutlers, and locksmiths. According to Schleiden, too, they were able physicians, poets, judges, musicians, and theologians, and three of their tribes (Zebulun, Dan, and Assur), living on the coast of the Mediterranean, divided the import and export trade with the Phœnicians. They were also good soldiers and astute generals, and so far from being averse to military service, they were subject to a severe conscription by which every young man entered the army when he reached his twentieth year. Nor did they abandon these occupations when their Temple was destroyed and their homes devastated. In the Roman Empire they were farmers and vine-dressers, handicraftsmen and manufacturers, wholesale merchants, soldiers, physicians, scientists and state officials. The influence which drove the Jews from these honourable occupations was the influence of a dominant, revengeful, and bigoted Christianity, which, with its adoption as the state religion of the Roman Empire by Constantine in 323 A.C., immediately devoted its attention to intensifying the hatred which had long divided Jews and Christians. A spirited description

of the inception of this antagonism appears in Lecky's *History of European Morals*.

Scorned or hated by those around him, his Temple levelled with the dust, and the last vestige of his independence destroyed, he (the Jew) clung with a desperate tenacity to the hopes and principles of his ancient creed. In his eyes the Christians were at once apostates and traitors. He could not forget that in the last hour of his country's agony, when the armies of the Gentile encompassed Jerusalem, and when the hosts of the faithful flocked to its defence, the Christian Jews had abandoned the fortunes of their race, and refused to bear any part in the heroism and the sufferings of the closing scene. They had proclaimed that the promised Messiah, who was to restore the faded glories of Israel, had already come; that the privileges which had so long been the monopoly of a single people had passed to the Gentile world; that the race, which was once supremely blessed, was for all future to be accursed among mankind. The Christians viewed with exultation the calamities which fell upon the prostrate people whose cup of bitterness they were destined through long ages to fill to the brim. It is not, therefore, surprising that there should have arisen between the two creeds an animosity which paganism could never rival.

This animosity was in the Jew soon transformed into the harmless and whispered prejudices of humility, but in the heart of Christianity it rankled and flourished on the garbage of its own excesses, and with the earliest assumption of power by the Church, it became the business of its authorities to gratify it to repletion. In 357 A.D. Constantius forbade the employment of Christian slaves by Jews, dealing a severe blow at their power of competition in industry and agriculture, as in those days slave-labour was for the most part used. Previous to 418 the Jews laboured under no disability except the one I have mentioned, and their eligibility for public offices and the learned professions they had largely availed themselves of. In this year, however, Flavius Honorius disqualified them from all state employment except pleading in the law courts, and in 439 even this privilege was denied them by Theodosius II. The Jews, however, still occupied honourable positions everywhere, and as men of science were highly esteemed; Schleiden tells us that they were the only physicians trusted by the public. In 476 the Roman Empire fell to pieces, and with the tenacity which distinguishes the race the Jews immediately reverted, in the new German States, to the useful toil and equally valuable professions which had characterised their best days in their own land. In Germany they became *savants*, manufacturers, and agriculturists, and in France they were soon found in every department of work, from state employments to tilling the soil. The Christian Church, however, was not long in returning to its malignant *Judenhetze*. In the year 600 Gregory the Great, who, it must be confessed, was otherwise disposed to treat the Jews with justice, revived, in his attempt to extinguish slavery, the old ordinance of Constantius. Writing to Brunhilda and Theodebert II. of Austrasia, and Theoderich of Burgundy on the subject of slavery he successfully represented to them that the possession of Christian

slaves by Jews in their dominions was a scandal to the Church. Fourteen years later Clotaire II. adopted the recommendations of the Clermont and Maçon Councils, that Israelites should not occupy positions in the State service, which would give them authority over Christians, and during the following year the Council of Paris resolved that they should be dismissed from all State employment altogether. Charlemagne and Louis le Débonnaire prohibited the Jews from buying or selling sacred Church vessels, from receiving Christian hostages for debt, and from dealing in wine and cereals, and Charles the Bold ordered in 877 that whilst Christians paid one-eleventh of their earnings to the king, the Jews should pay one-tenth. During all the time that these efforts were being made to render life more of a vale of tears to the Jew, simply on account of his religion, it must be mentioned that the principal, if not the only merchants were Jews, and that not only was their commercial morality above suspicion, but by many their value to the community at large was reckoned deservedly high. There was consequently not the slightest justification for harassing them; and in the gradual restriction of Jewish enterprise, and the proportionate development of Christian aggressiveness, its material and moral disadvantages became speedily evident. Already pointed at, as the bearers of an hereditary reproach, their position was not improved by the celebrated Eucharistic controversies which broke out about this time. The disputes of Paschasius Radbertus with Ratramnus, and of Berengarius with Lanfranc, tended in an important degree to revive the bitterest issues at the basis of the mutual hostility of Jew and Christian, and when these and other similar influences—particularly the theory put forward in Anselm's *Cur Deus Homo*—joined to form the mighty confluent of the Crusades, the position of the Jews of Europe as the hated and despised of every class was settled. The first blood drawn by the Crusaders was Jewish blood. Dean Milman says:—

When the first immense horde of undisciplined fanatics of the lowest order, under the command of Peter the Hermit and Walter the Penniless, and under the guidance of a goose and a goat, assembled near the city of Treves, a murmur rapidly spread through the camp, that, while they were advancing to recover the sepulchre of their Redeemer from the Infidels, they were leaving behind worse unbelievers, the murderers of the Lord. . . . With one impulse the Crusaders rushed to the city and began a relentless pillage, violation, and massacre of every Jew they could find.

This was the definite commencement of a history of persecution which, for its long duration and calculated malignity, its sustained barbarity and complete injustice, is unexampled—persecution which, whatever the outcome of the conflict of creeds, will never cease to cast a shadow upon the history of Christianity. The physical and moral corruption of the Jews was now rapidly proceeded with. Whilst the perpetual imminence of personal attack was destroying all the manly qualities that they possessed, their systematic exclusion from

honourable walks in life drove them speedily to those contracted habits of thought and action—

Deep, hollow, treacherous, and full of guile.

which have not unnaturally lingered in their posterity. They were driven from the possession of lands and the membership of trade guilds; Gregory the Seventh in the throes of his conflict with Henry the Fourth of Bavaria, thundered his fiercest Bulls against them, and then, having no place in the prevailing feudal system, they became the disposable property of the various monarchs, and were bought, sold, pledged, and plundered, as so much merchandise.

At the fourth Lateran Council, when it was resolved that all heresies against the doctrine of Transubstantiation should be dealt with by the secular arm, Jews were specially mentioned as worthy whetstones for the zeal of a zealous Christianity, and in 1257 Alexander the Fourth, fearing that this suggestion of Innocent the Third was not religiously enough followed, issued a Bull in which he particularly exhorted the King of France and other potentates to see that the Jews wore a distinctive garb, and recommended them also to burn all the copies upon which they could lay their hands, of the books '*qui Thalmuth vulgariter appellantur, in quibus continentur errores contra fidem catholicam ac horribiles et intollerabiles blasphemie contra dominum nostrum Ihesum Xpum et beatam Mariam virginem matrem eius.*'

According to Kiesselbach the Jews soon found themselves compelled to deal only in used or second-hand articles, as their exclusion from markets prevented them from buying sufficiently advantageously to enable them to compete with Christian merchants; and others, having a little capital and no means of employing it, resorted to money-lending. It may be interesting to those Anti-Semites who now so glibly charge the Jews with a natural tendency to usury, to know that the earliest Jewish money-lender, of whom we have any record, was not a common type of Jew, but a learned French Rabbi—R. Jacob Tam—who so far from finding anything congenial in the placing of monies at interest, bitterly complained in public of the harsh necessity which prevented him from earning his living in any other way.

I may also be permitted to say a word on the subject of high interest. At the time that Jews first resorted to money-lending there was but little security for the lender, and interest was consequently very high. Instead of letting its fluctuations take their own course, the rates became fixed—generally equitably fixed—by Royal and municipal edicts, and sometimes they were as high as 86½ per cent. These rates not changing with the times, the money-lenders naturally became used to large profits, and so the evil indulgence stuck to them through the entire period of their social ostracism.

It would be tedious to recount all the various phases of the Jew-baiting of the subsequent seven hundred years; every student

of history is sufficiently acquainted with at least its broad lines. This, however, must be said: whatever notable act of persecution took place, whether it assumed the form of wholesale massacre or wholesale expulsion, whether the Jews were forbidden to emerge from their Ghettos, to don an ordinary dress, or to exercise honourable professions, it could always be traced, not indirectly but directly, to Christian ecclesiastical influences, although it was certainly enthusiastically carried out by the trained bigotry of the people. I may then boldly ask who is primarily responsible for that demoralisation of the Jews of which the Anti-Semites now complain if not the ancestors of their present opponents? 'Each of the great changes,' says Dean Milman, 'which were gradually taking place in the state of the world seemed to darken the condition of this unhappy people, till the outward degradation worked inward upon their own minds.' It is not quite clear what is meant here by 'great changes,' but there can be no doubt that Milman clearly appreciated—although he did not definitely expound it—the demoralising influence of the persecution to which the Jews were exposed. On this head the eminent historian was evidently confused by his desire to place in a favourable light the few apologies for the Jews which, for various political reasons, were issued from the Vatican, quite oblivious of the fact that these apologies were but poor compensation for the ordinances which had primarily subjugated the legitimate aspirations of the Jews. However, there can be no question that it was solely in consequence of Christian persecution, brought about by authoritative Christian encouragement, that Jews were made gradually to imbibe all the vices of servitude.

It is then in the highest sense indecent for Christians now, so shortly after our emancipation, and when, too, we have already made such astonishing progress, to reproach us with evil qualities generated by their own cruelty. Nay! in face of our uncomplaining patience, it is the vulgar cowardice of the bully to endeavour to reawaken a persecution on these disingenuous charges. If the Jews, instead of being so full of vitality and intelligence, so ready to forgive the injuries of the past, and so cheerfully prepared to bear their share of national burdens and responsibilities, were a by-word for depravity and crime, Christians, so far from blaming them, should blush with a conscience-stricken shame whenever a recollection of their existence crossed their minds. Had they, under the fearful tortures which they have endured, become a nation of idiots, they would only have formed a fitting monument to the brutality and infamous uncharitableness with which through the ages they have been wantonly persecuted by the *soi-disant* votaries of a Gospel of Mercy.

Schlegel, in referring to the miseries of Jewish ostracism, remarks that 'it is a problem whether any other people placed in a similar situation . . . would have done better; or whether mankind in general subjected to similar trials would have come off more success-

fully.' I quote this generous reflection of the by no means biassed son-in-law of Moses Mendelssohn, because it is a text from which I may review the miscellanea of the arguments of the Anti-Semites, which are all of a somewhat kindred character.

To the problem I have quoted I answer emphatically that no other people could have done so well or could have come off so successfully, for the simple reason that no people exists which possesses the method of consolation and the staff of hopefulness of which the Jews were and still are the sole possessors. Their method of consolation they found in their peculiarly domestic religious ceremonial; their staff of hopefulness was the optimism which was bred of the simplicity of their theology and the never-ceasing demonstration of the practical superiority of their religion. Now, what the Anti-Semites, and even their abettors in England, ask of us—of course not on religious grounds!—is that we should abandon, by intermarriage with the Gentile, this faith which has preserved us so marvellously. They say that whilst the Jews do not adopt this course they are virtually foreigners in whatever land they may reside, and that their exclusiveness and distinctiveness must earn for them suspicion and dislike. This is the comparatively moderate view taken by the *Spectator* on a recent occasion; Professor Goldwin Smith and the German Anti-Semites go further, and say they cannot be patriots whilst they retain such distinctiveness.

These arguments are evidently conceived in an entire ignorance of the more practical differences between Christianity and Judaism. Whilst the former is, so to speak, a Sabbath religion, the latter is an everyday religion, exercising a purifying influence over every detail of domestic life. The Christian who has never lived in a Jewish family, or studied its mode of life, can have no conception how intimate, so to speak, is the Jew with his God; how to this day, even, he observes in every arrangement of his household, every act of his home life, some wise ordinance, of either a hygienic or moral nature, which has been handed down to him as a consecrated peculiarity of his religious denomination. These observances are only discretionary with Christians; on Jews they are obligatory, and their wisdom is so universally acknowledged that they form an indissoluble link between the Jew and his religion. It is then not an abstract theological question which divides the two creeds, but practical difficulties, for the solution of which Christians will not make any permanent sacrifices and Jews dare not. It has occurred to me that a curious apology for the social distinctiveness of Jews might be made in the spirit of that metaphorical interpretation of the Scriptures which is so much in vogue with a certain class of polemical disputants, although it would be at variance with the curse which the Israelites are supposed to realise by their homeless state. In an earlier portion of this article I have referred to the origin and meaning (according to its philological history) of the

word 'Semite.' Now there can be no doubt that the meaning of the blessings which Noah foretold for the descendants of his sons Japhet and Shem was that in the case of the former his posterity should enjoy all the advantages of temporal dominion and wealth, whilst spiritual supremacy should be the destiny of the issue of the latter. 'God shall enlarge Japhet,' said Noah, whereas of Shem he said, 'Blessed be the *Lord God* of Shem.' Shem was then to have been, according to the commentary of Delitzsch, the bearer of the Divine Name, the repository of the religious tradition, and there is further evidence that in this capacity, and for the purpose of carrying out a mission of religion and enlightenment, his descendants were to have been a wandering people, wandering too amongst the sons of Japhet. Noah himself says, 'and he (Japheth) shall dwell in the tents of Shem,' showing that the former in the course of his worldly enterprises would require the spiritual ministrations of the latter. Again at Exodus xix. 6, we find the confirming passage: 'And ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests and an holy nation;' and in the sixth verse of the sixty-first chapter of Isaiah is a most extraordinary foreshadowing of this destiny of the Jews in the words 'Ye shall be named the priests of the Lord: men shall call you the ministers of our God; *ye shall eat the riches of the Gentiles and in their glory shall ye boast yourselves.*' It would therefore appear that the Jews remain distinct for the purpose of preserving in their integrity certain theological teachings and a certain enlightening influence, which it will one day be their mission to impress upon the world. This theory I advance, of course, only as a literary curiosity, but it is one which might be used with effect when so many preachers are intent upon justifying the persecutions of the Jews and the missionary enterprises of Christians with casuistical interpretations of more or less obscure passages in the Scriptures.

And now as to the political bearing of the distinctiveness of the Jews. Here again we meet with an extraordinary illustration of the contradictory character of the arguments of Anti-Semitism. Presuming that the argument of natural depravity has been answered, and the perfectibility of the Jews established by numberless instances of the eminences to which they have risen during the short period since their emancipation, the restless and chameleonlike hatred of the Anti-Semites breaks out in this form—I quote from an article in the *Reichsbote*:—

Foreign nations should know that the German people allows its Press to be written and its public opinion formed by Jews, that our authors and artists sigh under the censorship of a Judaistic literature, and that the real beat of the national German pulse cannot be felt because the Hebrew critic hampers it. In England rules the Englishman; in France the Frenchman; and all we want is that in Germany the German, and not the Jew, shall give the tone. We wish the world to be influenced with respect not only for German arts, but also for German civilisation; but this

cannot be if these are stifled by an overmastering Judaism. We wish to have no Roman Empire of the German nation, but neither do we desire a Jewish Empire of the German nation. What we want is a German Empire of the German nation, and that we can only get when the German becomes and remains the bearer and disseminator of wealth and culture.

The meaning of this is that the Anti-Semites regard the intellectual activity of the Jews with as much discontent as their depravity—a statement of a somewhat contradictory nature, but still soberly put forward. Wherever they look they complain that they see their country weighted with Jewish influence. Their universities are deeply tinged with Jewish teachings, their foremost philosophers and their most popular journalists are Jews. German aspirations and opinions are thus, they say, asphyxiated by a predominance which cannot be acceptable to the nation because it is Jewish. Granted that these aspirations and opinions have proved their weakness and stupidity by their inability to cope with the dominating influence, still this weakness and stupidity represent the legitimate pulsations of the German people, and they therefore crave for their ascendancy. But, it may be asked, why should not Jews, born and bred in Germany, be as capable of representing the patriotism of the nation as votaries of any other creed? The Anti-Semites simply reply, ‘because they are Jews.’ Now this is no new argument, no such novel evolution of modern philosophy, as the *Judenfressern* seem to think it. Close upon a century ago the very same point was publicly discussed and logically answered. M. de Talleyrand observed in the *Assemblée Nationale* in 1791 :—

There can be no difference between these men (the Jews) and ourselves but in the exercise of their religious worship; take that away, what can we see in them but fellow-citizens and brothers? *Were it otherwise, it would be religion that gives civil and political rights*; but it is birth, domicile, or landed property that confers them. If we reject the Israelites as Jews, we punish them for being born in one religion rather than in another; this is a manifest infraction of all laws, humane or civil.

On the same ground it may be said that if the argument of the Anti-Semites is followed to its logical conclusion, it is religion, and religion alone, which can evoke the patriotic instinct, and consequently that a man's patriotism should be under the direction of his religious opinions. There might be some reason for taking up this charge against the Jews if it could be shown that they have, at the dictates of religious prejudice, ever been unfaithful to the land of their adoption or birth. The very contrary is the case. The Jews have ever been amongst the most orderly and attached of citizens, and when they have risen to position and responsibility in the State their duties have been discharged with conspicuous zeal and impartiality. There are some who have the assurance to assert that the tendency of Judaism itself is to subjugate the interests of the Gentile neighbour and fellow-countryman to tribal interest. As, however, there is not

the shadow of a foundation for this statement, and no attempt at its justification has ever been made, let me merely ask whether the rôle played by Judaism throughout the long period that its votaries were persecuted, was ever of so immoral a character as to warrant this charge?

The answer is emphatically, No! Whilst the demoniacal attitude of Christianity was outwardly transforming the Jew into a cringing, spiritless, and narrow-minded *chiffonnier*, in his heart of hearts a spark of his former self was kept alive by his ancient faith, and prevented that complete demoralisation from which, had it really taken place, there would have been no returning.

The Jew was never so demoralised but he had a sympathy for his brethren; he never fell so low that he forgot his God; and that his manhood never entirely deserted him is proved by the many occasions when, having to choose between dishonour and death, he heroically decided to die. This question of the patriotism of the Jew has been so exhaustively dealt with by other writers, and so triumphantly settled in his favour, that it were a work of supererogation for me to dwell upon it. On the other hand, the conviction of the prejudiced that the Jew cannot be a patriot, is so shifty and unsettled, so nervously ready with new objections, and so desirous to avail itself of every flimsy weapon that sophistry and superstition can invent, that I feel bound to state that I cannot believe that it ever really had any logical birth. It is evidently only one of those proverbial suspicions which haunt the minds of the guilty, very naturally put forward, now that we are rising in the world, by Christians who, in homely parlance, have a tendency to 'measure other people's corn by their own bushel.'

I could say much more in defence of my co-religionists against the charges of the Anti-Semites, but having, I hope, conclusively demonstrated the commonplace vulgarity of the whole agitation, and the artificiality and clumsiness of its gospel, I will be satisfied. It may be imagined that as a Jew I have followed the progress of this new attempt to revive against my people the prejudices of mediævalism with an all-consuming indignation, and that it is under the influence of strong passion that I have penned the foregoing pages. For this I make no apology, and none I think will be expected of me. I know so well by my own feelings, and by a thorough appreciation of the unwarped sympathies of my co-religionists, that a more gratuitous revival of rancour never was attempted; and when I remember the persecutions to which my race have been subjected in the past, the splendid spirit of conciliation and forgiveness which they have ever manifested, and that in spite of all this the tendency of modern Christianity is to foster, if not the hatred, at any rate the contempt and suspicion, with which the Jew is regarded, I cannot repress my indignation. In face of the general culture of the Jews, their remarkable capacity for progress and the high distinction which they have earned for themselves, it is more than a disgrace that by noisy

missions and by the explicit lessons of the Christian prayer-books the general public should be taught to believe that the Jews stand upon an inferior moral level to themselves. Now, however, that this agitation has broken out, and that the whole of the enlightened world has been startled by this proof that religious hatred still exists, the philosophic teachings of the day must, for the credit of civilisation, combine for its extinction. I look forward, with, I hope, not too much sanguineness, to a period when Jew and Christian will appreciate one another—when, in the words of Lessing's monk, the Christian will say to the Jew, 'Ihr seid ein Christ! Bei Gott, Ihr seid ein Christ! Ein beszrer Christ war nie,' and like the immortal Nathan, the Jew shall reply, 'Was mich Euch zum Christen macht, das macht Euch mir zum Juden.'

LUCIEN WOLF.

IRISH EMIGRATION.

IN laying before the public last spring the result of my inquiries into the distress in Ireland, I ventured to express the opinion that for the poorest class in certain tracts in the West—poor from the inherent poverty of the soil—the only remedy was systematic and organised emigration. ‘For these people,’ I wrote,¹ ‘the dwellers at Camus, or Carraroe with its five-and-twenty miles of alternate huts and boulders, neither peasant proprietary nor fixity of tenure can be expected to be remedial measures, and if it be objected that these are exceptional cases, it would not be difficult to bring forward many other localities of which, in varying degrees, the same might be said.’ For these I urged that emigration, in the absence of local employment, seemed a remedy much to be preferred to scattering them over waste lands in Ireland, which needed the tardy and costly operation of reclamation; adding, ‘whatever may be the merits of “scattering,” I cannot think that its claims can compete with emigration.’ And in reply to the argument that the natural forces at work, now drawing thousands to seek a livelihood in other lands, are sufficiently powerful without any legislative interference,’ I pointed out that, as a matter of fact, these forces rarely touched the very poorest, who were unable to help themselves; further adding: ‘That what seems to me to be needed is that families should be assisted to emigrate from *overcrowded* parts of Ireland under careful and systematic supervision, and that this oversight should not end in Ireland, but should be continued under the charge of properly qualified agents in Canada or elsewhere, whose object it should be to give assistance in the selection of land or in obtaining employment for the emigrants.’

A more influential pen than mine writes in the same strain. In a paper recently laid by Lord Dufferin before the Irish Land Commission, after enumerating the measures which he recommends for adoption, he adds (see *Times*, January 4):—

But for the extreme west of Ireland, what hope is there from any of the foregoing devices? Along that region there extends a broad riband of hopeless misery which no change in the present relations of landlord and tenant is likely to alleviate.

¹ *Irish Distress and its Remedies*, 5th edition, pp. 109–10. Bidgway & Co.

Perennial destitution¹²⁹ accentuated by periodical seasons of famine has been the sole experience of its inhabitants during the present century. To convert these poor people into peasant proprietors would be impracticable. To make them copy-holders under a quit-rent would be scarcely more to the purpose. Even to give them the land for nothing would not prove a permanent alleviation. Many of them, indeed, have no land at all. What then is to be done? Manifestly the only remedy is emigration. At this moment emigration is being much discredited, but to anyone who, like myself, has seen its effects, such an outcry has no meaning. In my opinion it is simply inhuman to perpetuate from generation to generation a state of things which has been deplored by every traveller who has visited those parts during the last eighty years. Within the compass of little more than a week, after a pleasant voyage, a proportion of these unhappy multitudes might be landed on the wharves of Quebec, the women healthier, the children rosier, the men in better heart and spirits than ever they have been since the day they were born. Four or five days more would plant them without fatigue or inconvenience on a soil so rich that it has only to be scratched to grow the best wheat and barley that can be raised on the Continent of America.

With the object of seeing for myself these future harvest fields of the world, and of inquiring how far they could be peopled with advantage by the poor people of the west of Ireland, I paid a visit to America last autumn, and returned a few weeks ago. I paid particular attention to the rising and important States of Iowa and Minnesota, and to our own Province of Manitoba in the great North-Western Territory, meeting with a large number both of older residents and of newly-arrived emigrants from Europe, Canada, and the more easterly States of America. From these gentlemen I invariably received the greatest courtesy in the prosecution of my inquiries, and from them as well as from other sources I received very explicit information which enables me to corroborate all that has been said of the fertility of these vast tracts. In Minnesota, the 'Catholic Colonisation Association,' directed by the splendid energy of Bishop Ireland, is providing a home and an honourable future for many a poor Irishman or others from the eastern States; while in Manitoba the Canadian Government is holding out the most liberal inducements to any who will come to till the soil. Without wishing to recommend the Canadian territory as a more suitable field for Irish emigration than that offered by the United States, I shall refer to it chiefly in the following remarks; for if there is to be, as I uphold, organised emigration (gradually carried out) on a scale to be termed national, it is manifestly more natural and convenient to deal with our own colony of Canada than with a foreign Government, even although it be as friendly as that of the United States. There is also the additional reason for doing so that the Canadian lands are offered free, whilst those in the States must now be purchased at a cost of 10s. to 30s. per acre. But anything that I have to say in favour of western Canada as a field for Irish industry may be considered to apply with equal or greater force to the States of Minnesota and Iowa.

The great prairie region of north-western Canada consists of a

triangle, having its south-west angle in Manitoba, its base stretching about 1,000 miles along the parallel of latitude 49° (the boundary of the United States), its second side running 700 or 800 miles northward along the base of the Rocky Mountains, and its third side following a broken line of lakes, beginning with the Great Peace River in the north, and passing through Lake Athabasca and Deer Lake to Winnipeg. This represents a tract of about 250,000,000 acres of fine agricultural country, nearly ten times as large as all Ireland. The southern portion of it is watered by the Saskatchewan River, which with its two great branches flows through the rich central districts into Lake Winnipeg. It has been navigated for more than 1,000 miles. Lake Winnipeg itself is 300 miles long by fifty to sixty miles wide. Its outlet is by the Nelson River to Hudson's Bay, at a point eighty miles nearer to Liverpool than is New York. Through this vast region the Canadian Pacific Railway, the scheme for carrying out which is now being warmly discussed in the Ottawa Parliament, is intended to be carried.

By this project it is proposed to unite the Atlantic seaboard of Canada in the East with the province of Columbia and the Pacific Ocean in the extreme West, and thus to render our Canadian possessions independent of the United States for the conveyance of grain or other merchandise.

Whatever portion of this vast project may be relegated to the distant future, that which extends 400 miles eastward from Winnipeg to Lake Superior, and 700 or 800 miles westward to the Rocky Mountains and thence to British Columbia, seems within reach, under spirited management, in the next three or four years. Already some portions of this railway have been completed, and by its southern branch to Emerson, Manitoba and Winnipeg are connected with the Western States by means of the great network of railways which extend through Minnesota to Chicago and thence to Canada and the States.

Manitoba with its 9,000,000 of acres stands like one square on this great chess-board, and is watered by the Red River and Assiniboine, whose streams unite at Winnipeg, flowing thence northward into the lake. The deep alluvial soil of this district is unequalled for cultivation of wheat, and although the moisture of some portions may for a time hinder their development, the wonderful fertility of the Red River lands must cause them to come much more fully under cultivation. Indeed, they are fast being taken up, while settlements are already in formation, 200 to 300 miles west of Winnipeg, the capital of Manitoba. Among recent emigrants I met a considerable number who had selected tracts along the Saskatchewan, and heard of other settlers even by the more remote Peace River.

Is this newly-opened colony fitted to be the home of thousands, or it may be of tens of thousands, of poor Irish emigrants? This was

the question I set before me. At first sight it may seem an easy one to answer. *Here* are millions of acres of most productive land to be given away, or sold so cheaply that an acre may be bought for the wages of one to three days' unskilled labour. *There* is a waste of boulders, and brown moor, swept by the drenching Atlantic gales. *Here* there is a great and increasing demand for labour at a high rate of wages. *There* are tens of thousands of strong hands and arms needing, nay demanding, to be employed. Is this not the very place we want? the long-sought for 'paradise' for the Irish peasant? Yes, if we can only bring the peasant to the 'paradise.' This is the problem to be solved, and to be solved in the best manner possible. The primary difficulty which is more or less common to all emigration schemes is the cost of bringing out the emigrant. Here it would be magnified by the great cost of travelling from the eastern seaboard (say 2,000 miles) to a distant inland territory; and this land conveyance cannot be taken at less than 6*l.* per head, including food, in addition to the sea-passage costing 5*l.* or 6*l.* more.

In estimating the other difficulties that present themselves, it will be convenient to consider them under two heads as they affect (1) the emigrant as a labourer, (2) the emigrant as a farmer without means.

1. *The Emigrant Labourer.*—The ordinary rate of wages in Manitoba is as follows:—For unskilled men, 1½ to 2 dollars per day; for boys, 15 or more dollars per month and board; for bricklayers and carpenters, 3½ to 4 dollars per day; for gardeners and coachmen, 30 to 40 dollars per month; for female servants, 12 to 25 dollars per month and board. For single men board and lodging may be had for 4 dollars per week, and for a married man and his wife it would cost little more.

But high as these rates are, it has at once to be understood that the climate for nearly half the year forbids any employment on the soil or in building. Unskilled labourers, therefore (unless engaged for the year), and bricklayers are, to a large extent, dependent on a seven months' wage for a twelve months' maintenance. That a large number of unskilled labourers might find employment at a distance of from seventy to one hundred miles as lumberers is certain, but for married men with families it would hardly answer to be separated for so long a period. We have, then, to consider whether the seven months' wage would suffice, taking it at say ten dollars per week, with board and lodging costing four dollars. Would the margin after providing clothing and other necessities suffice? With great frugality, and the employment obtained by the younger members of the family, the evidence of other parts of Canada or the States proves that it might. Washerwomen, for instance, can earn a dollar a day and food. But coal or wood costs 5*l.* or 6*l.* per ton. A large supply of warm clothes and bedding is also necessary. And for the first year

or two no doubt the very closest economy would have to be practised: after all nothing new to the Irish peasant we have before us. After their first year I think there would be no question as to the labourers' doing well.

But it must be remembered that any large influx of labourers upon a limited population, as in Manitoba, would inevitably tend to the reduction of wages, unless they were employed on some special work which would not otherwise be taken in hand. Such work might be found on the Canadian Pacific Railway. It is true that the nearer portions of the western section are very light, involving comparatively little labour. Last autumn two gangs of forty men each were laying down nearly a mile a day. But further West as well as eastward of Winnipeg, towards Thunder Bay, more labour will be needed, and it was probably in reference to these sections that Mr. Lynskey, the Superintendent of the Canadian Pacific Railway, informed me 5,000 men would readily find employment.

Should it be proposed to bring out large working gangs for the Canadian Pacific Railway, it is to be hoped that a well-digested plan may be devised for their oversight from the day they land on the continent. The drinking saloons of Winnipeg already abound, and ample experience has shown how often demoralisation and ruin have attended the pioneer workmen of other railways on this continent. It would probably be best to give only part wages in money to the labourers on this railway; the balance being given in proper shelter and food, with allotments of land on completion of the line. The labourers would thus become eventually small farmers and confer a double benefit on the country. Their advent would then be hailed with satisfaction, in place of their becoming a bye-word and reproach to our civilisation.

I was informed by the Hon. I. Ryan, of Portage-la-Prairie, 70 miles west of Winnipeg, that it would answer to employ labour on land, bringing increased quantities into cultivation, if men could be had at, say, 150 dollars per annum with board. At this rate he thought thousands of acres in his district now unproductive would be brought under the plough, and hundreds of industrious men and women might readily find work. This appears an important matter for consideration as regards the emigration of single men and women.

From the evidence of Archbishop Taché, of St. Boniface, Manitoba (who has special knowledge on this subject), and of others, I believe that while there would be a natural and strong objection to the sudden importation without due notice into their midst of thousands of Irish labourers, the colonists would heartily welcome a limited number of families, and in this way a very considerable number might be yearly absorbed.

Leaving the emigrant labourer, I take up—

2 *The Emigrant Farmer without means.*—At this point let us

consider the offer made by the Canadian Government to all emigrants, which is as follows :—

Each *bônâ-fide* settler, on the payment of a fee of 2*l.* to the Dominion Land Office, will have a grant made to him of a 'quarter section'² of land of 160 acres, to be chosen by himself or his agent, within certain assigned limits on the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway or other unallotted land in the north-western territory. He will further have the right of pre-emption of a second 'quarter section' of 160 acres in the same neighbourhood at fixed prices, varying from one to two and a half dollars per acre.

The Canadian Government will probably also give to the settler and his family *assisted passages* from Liverpool to the American or Canadian port ; that is, they will enable them to come for a fare of 5*l.* per head, the regular steamer fare being 6*l.* Lastly, the Canadian Government will place at the disposal of the settler the services of their Emigration Department, to help him from his arrival in the country till he reaches his destination.

With this offer before us we have to consider the best means and the outlay necessary to place the poor emigrant farmer on his land, with the means of existing until he has tilled it and raised a crop sufficient for his wants. For it would be only to court failure were

² The lands of Manitoba, as well as of Minnesota, are divided into townships, each measuring six miles square, and each divided into thirty-six sections of one mile square, or 640 acres. They are numbered as follows :—

N					
31	32	33	34	35	36
30	29	28	27	26	25
19	20	21	22	23	24
18	17	16	15	14	13
7	8	9	10	11	12
6	5	4	3	2	1
S					

Each section again is divided into four quarter sections, each containing 160 acres, and each of these again into fourths, or sixteenths of a section of forty acres each, as shown below. The unit of property is the quarter section of 160 acres.

N			
13	14	15	16
12	11	10	9
5	6	7	8
4	3	2	1
S			

we to place him on the richest untilled land in the world without tools or shelter, or the means of procuring them and maintaining life.

And, first, as to the outlay. If we are to deal with large numbers, every item must be scrutinised and kept as low as possible.

After much inquiry and most careful deliberation with several Canadian gentlemen, I believe that the following estimate may be looked on as a *fair* basis for calculation. It will be seen that it involves an outlay of 100*l.* for a family of five persons.

	£	s.	d.
Sea voyage, 3 adults at 5 <i>l.</i> , 2 under age at 2 <i>l.</i> 10 <i>s.</i>	20	0	0
Land-transport, 2,000 miles, including food, to Winnipeg	25	0	0
Cost of conveyance to allotment	1	0	0
Food and fuel needed after arrival until wages are earned	4	0	0
Total up to the point of settlement on the land	50	0	0
Erection of a small house, ³ 18 × 12 ft., \$100 ¹	20	0	0
Sinking a well, \$20	4	0	0
Stove, bedding, cooking utensils, simplest possible kind, \$40	8	0	0
Two ploughings of, say, 8 acres at \$4	6	8	0
Seed (wheat, oats, or potatoes) at \$1·50 per acre	2	8	0
Harrowing, sowing ditto, at \$2 per acre	3	4	0
Land fee paid to Government	2	0	0
Contingencies	4	0	0
Total	£100	0	0

This I consider the *lowest* figure at which we can place the cost of starting a family of five persons in possession of 160 acres of good land, with a house and utensils sufficient for their wants, and with eight acres cropped. It allows nothing, it will be observed, for outfit before leaving Ireland, or for agricultural tools, far less for cattle or pigs. The plough &c. must and can be hired until the farmer can afford to buy.

Supposing the emigrant thus landed in the early summer, he must support himself by manual labour, of which I have already said there is abundant demand, until his first crops are ready. He might earn for 4 months 1½ dollars a day, or say 36*s.* a week, or 30*l.* for the season, and this, with the earnings of any other able-bodied member of his family, and with the crops or vegetables sown, should be ample to provide for them until the following spring. From this also he must pay the cost in his second spring of breaking up other 8 or 10 acres of land, at \$4 per acre, of ploughing again the land of last season at \$1·50 per acre, and of seed for the whole. This will cost from 10*l.* to 12*l.*, for without those of his own he has to hire both plough and cattle. This second year he should earn by labour at least as much as in the first year, 30*l.* He will have the crops on 16 to 18 acres—at least 250 bushels, worth say 50*l.* If no unforeseen circumstances arise, this will enable him to buy—

* The hut should be built and the ground broken up before the emigrants' arrival, and arrangements will be required for this.

2 pigs at \$5	10
1 cow	25
1 yoke of oxen or horse	100
1 plough	15
Total	\$150 or 30%.

He will thus begin his second winter better off than his first, and with a year's experience.

At the beginning of the third year our emigrant will be in an almost independent position, the owner of 160 acres of good land, of which eighteen are broken up, and in possession of the needful implements to break up as much more as he feels able to undertake. This is no imaginary picture; it may be verified from many cases now to be found in Manitoba or Minnesota. All may not make such rapid progress. They may not have done more in the third year than is sketched above in the second. But is this not better than they are doing now in Galway and Mayo? Better in every way, whether as regards the present or prospective good of the people, than the results of any similar outlay of capital in the west of Ireland.

It has been shown that 100% are necessary to place a family on a prairie allotment of Canada; and I think it will be generally agreed that, along with the free grant of land and the assistance rendered to the emigrant, the principle of self-help should be stimulated by requiring the repayment of the money advanced.

In this, I feel assured, the Canadian Government would be willing to assist by placing this advance in the position of a registered first mortgage, and withholding the grant of the patent or title to the land until the amount is repaid. That the advance on well-chosen lands given by Government would be perfectly secure is, I think, evident. The improvements and buildings would probably give it a market value of from 5 to 10 dollars per acre, and make the whole 160 acres worth from 150% to 300%, according to situation, &c.

I estimate that the 100% advanced, with 5 per cent. interest, might be repaid by the emigrant within seven years. But by what agency are these payments to be recovered? On this question I regret that I can give no very distinct reply. If the Canadian Government would undertake to do it through their existing tax-collectors, I think that would be the simplest agency to employ. But various objections have been raised to this mode of collection. The difficulty is increased, moreover, by the consideration that the Canadian Government disapproves, from political and other reasons, of establishing purely Irish colonies. Bishop Ireland in Minnesota also considers it of great importance that the Irish settlers should be mixed up with others, say Germans, Scotch, Canadians, &c. The consequence is that if large numbers were gradually to come out they would be spread over a very considerable area, and hence the

cost and difficulty of collecting the instalments become considerable. But I cannot admit this as an insuperable objection to a scheme otherwise sound, and I cannot doubt means will be found to overcome it.

Assuming then that under a well-devised system an organised Irish emigration could be carried out with great benefit alike to the emigrant and to the parent country, and that such an emigration should be assisted by the English Government, the question by what machinery shall this be done demands consideration. I might well be content to leave it with those so much more competent than myself to form an opinion, but having had the opportunity of conversing with men of various shades of opinion in Canada on the question, as well as the privilege of speaking most freely with the Governor-General, and Sir John Macdonald, and other leading members of the Canadian Government, I shall venture to record the results of these conversations upon my own mind.

Three suggestions have been made.

I. That the emigration shall be undertaken by the joint action of the Imperial and Canadian Governments, the former supplying the capital at a low or nominal rate (say 2 or 3 per cent.), repayable over a term of years, and the latter undertaking the entire care and oversight of the emigrants, and the recovery of the advances made to each family.

II. That a Colonisation Association should be formed composed of a number of leading English, Irish, and Canadian gentlemen, to whom the Home Government should, under carefully-considered regulations, make the advances required, also repayable at a low rate of interest over a term of years; or that the Association should obtain the money by shares in the market as a commercial transaction.

III. That the Home Government should appoint an Emigration Commission, consisting of two or three well-known and competent men to whom the whole work of the emigration should be entrusted. In this case, as in the first, the Home Government would advance the necessary capital, but the Commission would arrange for the recovery of the instalments.

I. In examining these suggestions it will be felt that (regarded from an English point of view) the first possesses the merit of great simplicity, and involves the transfer to the Canadian Government of the whole responsibility of settling the emigrants. And, considering that these emigrants will for the future belong to the Dominion, this seems only right and proper. But members of the Canadian Government urge weighty objections to this plan. One I have already alluded to—their objection to recovering the advances from the settlers as a part of their taxes. They urge besides the impossibility of eviction on the part of a Government in case of non-payment,

and the openings afforded to jobbery and to political difficulties in reference to voting in the newly settled districts.

II. The same difficulty of recovering the capital advanced would present itself to some extent, were the emigration managed through an association, whether it received a loan from the Home Government or raised the capital by shares. Yet there seems little reason to fear that such an association, undertaking the work on sound commercial principles, purchasing the land in Minnesota or in the north-western territory, and employing its own agents for recovering the advances, might be carried on without financial loss. Bishop Ireland's Catholic Colonisation Association in Minnesota, to which I have already alluded, shows this to be practicable. There will, however, always be a feeling that where the interests of tens of thousands of our Irish fellow-subjects are concerned, those responsible for their emigration should be directly accountable to Parliament, and not merely to a private or commercial association, however well disposed.

III. We come, then, to the third suggestion—an *Imperial Emigration Commission*. This suggestion would have the strong approval of Sir John Macdonald and other influential Canadians. It would, I believe, have the entire support of their Government, who would be willing to place at its disposal, free of cost, the whole of their Emigration and Land Commission staff. The Commissioners appointed would be above the reach of political or other influence, and if really practical business men, willing to devote themselves loyally to the work and to go into every detail, the scheme could hardly fail of success. One of the Commission ought probably to be a Canadian, having an intimate knowledge of the country, and, if possible, a practical acquaintance with the agriculture of the north-west territory. With the aid given by the Canadian Government, the cost of this Commission should not be much beyond the salaries of the officers. It would be their duty to arrange for the emigrant's journey from his cabin in Connaught to the ship, and to see that he had a sufficient outfit; to settle the terms of his voyage to America, to receive him on landing, and have him promptly forwarded to his allotment, and fed on the journey; to have a hut ready for him there, and a patch of land broken up and sown; to put him in the way of hiring implements and of obtaining work; to keep him if possible out of the way of the grog shop; to keep before his mind in the heat of summer that a cold winter was approaching, such as he had no conception of, and to insist, therefore, on his providing himself with fuel and bedding to withstand its rigour.

Everything would depend on the gentlemen selected for this Commission. I cannot doubt that competent men are to be found for such duties as I have described, and, once found, this system would probably give the best chance to the Irish emigrant. Nor need we fear that commissioners, having obtained this personal

knowledge of the emigrants, would fail in devising some plan for recovering the advances made to them.

Lest I should be accused of trying to set colonisation to Manitoba in too rosy a light, of trying to prove too much, it is right that I should notice the objections often made to it, which ought to be fully considered. These objections are:—

1. The water in some districts is said to be alkaline and unwholesome. No doubt there is some truth in this, and to strangers at Winnipeg, for instance, it forms a serious drawback. The wells being shallow are often impregnated with alkaline and other objectionable qualities. There is, however, an abundant supply, and, with care as to boiling, any injurious tendency is much lessened. This is just one of the points to be attended to in selecting sites for emigrants.

2. Fuel is very scarce and dear, and for a time this presents serious difficulties. There is little timber on the prairies, except on the banks of the streams, and the burning of the grass interferes with the growth of timber, for which otherwise the land is admirably adapted. In Minnesota I found prairie grass tightly twisted into wisps used as a fuel, and I was assured that a man in three days could mow enough for the year's supply. If this can be generally adopted, it gives a ready and cheap fuel. But ere long the eastern and northern extensions of the Canadian Pacific Railway will be carried through forest tracts, and timber no doubt will be sent into Manitoba at a low price, as at present it is to the settlers along the railway through Minnesota. Coal, too, is to be found on the Souris and Saskatchewan river districts, and Mr. Stephen, of Montreal, who is largely interested in the subject, assured me that within two years they would be able to lay down coal at Winnipeg, from southern Minnesota, at \$6, or 24s. per ton. At present it costs nearly 5*l*.

3. The heavy rains. Settlers from western Ireland are not likely to object to moisture, and the country as a whole has an extremely dry atmosphere. In fine weather on the prairies one is almost independent of roads, and, except over swamps, can drive nearly anywhere. But at some seasons the settlers must be prepared for heavy rains, which soak into the rich alluvial soil, and make roads and plains almost impassable. This is one of the drawbacks to be faced in some districts, and it is almost a necessary evil where anyone is living on lands of such deep rich fertility. As population increases no doubt the roads will be improved.

4. The intense cold, and the long winter. This must be duly acknowledged. From the beginning of December until the end of March frost reigns supreme, and a thermometer standing 30° to 40° below zero is a cold we can hardly imagine in England. The climate is, however, so dry and the air so still that, with the exception of occasional storms of blinding snow and wind, the residents state that the cold is by no means unpleasant or difficult to bear. There is a great absence of illness, and persons suffering from asthma often

come into Manitoba to reside for the sake of the pure dry air. The freedom from all malarious fevers in autumn is also important to notice. Horses and cattle also seem to endure the cold winters without injury.

Looking at the map and noticing that Manitoba is quite to the south of the great north-west territory, one would be apt to suppose if it is cold there, it must be still colder further north. But as a matter of fact it is not so, for the isothermal line which cuts the south end of Lake Winnipeg, runs from thence north-west as far as the Peace River, keeping to the north of the whole basin of the Saskatchewan. The mean temperature from April to August is 58°. In the summer the days are exceedingly hot, but the nights are always cool and fresh. On the whole, I am disposed to think that the severity of the weather is not more felt than it is generally throughout Canada. At the same time, it is most important that emigrants should understand and provide for it.

Here, it may be asked, has the poor Irish peasant, whose prosperity we are planning, got within himself the necessary qualifications to fit him to be an emigrant? Has he got the self-help, the industry, the forethought, the self-command? In reply I can only point to what his brethren have done already—not to the poor, degraded Irishmen of New York and other eastern cities, but the numberless instances both in the United States and Canada, and to others who have already settled in the far west and succeeded.

I may mention one or two instances which came more especially under my notice. Whilst at Ottawa I was told by the member for the county that a large number of his constituents were Irishmen, many of whom are the descendants of those who fled from the famine of 1846-7. These people had at that period taken up small tracts of most unpromising forest-land, and by their energy and perseverance had cleared the timber and become possessors of well-cultivated farms. He spoke of them as a thrifty and industrious race, contented and well-to-do.

In many other districts I heard the same statement made; 'the Irish on the land are a thrifty and industrious people, whatever they are in the towns, with the degrading influences around them.' In Minnesota I had two counties pointed out to me, chiefly in the hands of Irishmen, which were remarked for their good cultivation.

The same was told me in several districts of New York and Pennsylvania, and the Hon. J. S. Hewett, of New York, informed me that the majority of the Irishmen employed in his extensive iron works had lands of their own, which were well cultivated, and had been much improved since the men, who had been tenants, were allowed at their own request to become purchasers.

On this subject I may be allowed again to quote Lord Dufferin. He says:—

If it is objected that the pauperised population of the west would make but poor emigrants, I would reply that their previous life will have fitted them infinitely better for their new destinies than the Icelanders, who have been driven forth from their Arctic abodes by an analogous necessity, since these last had never seen a plough, a road, a tree, or a field of corn; yet so delighted are they with their new possession that they have called it 'Paradise.'

There remains one other point to be noticed, and that not an easy one. In my pamphlet on 'Irish Distress and its Remedies,' I mentioned what is well known, that the Irish priesthood of the Church of Rome frequently object to emigration. It is not necessary to ascribe this, as is often ungenerously done, to their pay depending on the number of their flocks, which makes them reluctant to lose any parishioners. The pay is poor enough; and they earn it, for whatever be their failings, the priests look after their people. What they urge is that in the great American cities men and women become alike demoralised, and lose their simplicity. Their clerical brethren write to them to send no more out. Better, they say, that they should starve at home than run the risk of ruin there. But Bishop Ireland's Association meets this difficulty. The priests go with the people and enter into their interests. Schools and chapels are opened at once, and strict rules are enforced against the sale of spirits. I am glad that I am again supported by the opinion of Lord Dufferin when I say I am convinced that, if there is to be successful emigration on a large scale from western Ireland, it will be needful for the Government to unite with the priesthood, and to give them every assistance in providing for the religious care and oversight of their people. If priests could be sent with their flocks, it would be money well laid out to afford them a free passage, and a grant of land in their new settlement. In Canada this would be looked on as a perfectly natural arrangement.

I fear that some of those whose sympathies I should like best to enlist in favour of organised emigration may take exception to this recognition of the Roman Catholic Church. I can only ask them fully to consider the question as I believe I have done. Conversions from the Romish Church have not been very frequent in Ireland, and are not in the future likely to be more successful among a half-starved peasantry in Connaught than among prosperous settlers in Manitoba. It must surely be admitted that the people are likely to learn more good than evil from their priests, and that in the prairies it is better that they should have their priests than be altogether without religious teachers. At any rate I am not now proposing any scheme for conversion, but a scheme for lifting up a very poor and miserable class of people who exist almost at our doors, and making them into prosperous and independent farmers and labourers.

I cannot but see that any Government emigration scheme at present for Ireland would meet with hot opposition. It would be denounced as a treacherous device for weakening the country for the final struggle with England. We should be blamed as heartless

Saxons for wishing to drive a poor people from their ancestral homes. We should be assured that there is untold wealth still within its narrow seas, and that Ireland's bogs might be drained so as to support half as many more than its present population. All this we must expect. I advocate emigration in the cause of humanity, and not in that of any political party, for it is no party question. I would ask my opponents, who after five years will be most prosperous—the peasant possessing 160 acres of the finest wheat-land in America, on which he is paying off a debt of only 100*l.*, or his brother who elects to stay in Ireland cultivating an inferior soil, to drain and improve every single acre of which a sum of 10*l.* or 15*l.* has to be expended. Consider what can be done upon land in Ireland with 100*l.*, as compared with the same sum in the United States or Canada. I am no advocate for enforced emigration, but I wish that the Irishman should have clearly placed before him the opening which awaits him to go in and possess the good land.

Doubtless he will have hardships to endure, no emigrant's life has been begun without. But the hardships he will be called to suffer he will suffer in common with the sons of gentlemen of culture and position, with large farmers from Canada or England or Scotland, who with the golden hope of the future before them are willing to brave the rigours and difficulties of a life in the Saskatchewan or Red River valleys.

I cannot do better than close what I have to say in the words of a valued friend in the *Nineteenth Century* for January.

Mr. F. Seebohm writes as follows:—

Resist the temptation artificially to provide for the maintenance of population at too high a level. . . . Compare the waste lands of Ireland with the trans-Atlantic prairies, and instead of asking the question whether it will barely pay to plough up the Irish bog, boldly ask which will pay best, the same labour and capital expended here or there; and according to the answer cultivate the Irish bog or leave it alone. . . . Open the sluice of emigration as widely as possible till a real level in population is reached, grudging no longer the flow of population to the place where it is most wanted. Never mind if, having done justice to the peasant tenants of Ireland, the free course of economic laws should be found there as in England, as capital increases, to work in favour of large rather than of small holdings. Rejoice if Irish tenants find a better investment for their capital than can be got from a few poor acres of land, and a wider field for their increasing enterprise and energy than bogs and mountains afford. If *this* should be the result of England's doing justice to Ireland, then the higher happiness and freedom of her sons, wherever they may live, will reflect back a greater prosperity on their old country and upon those who stay at home than any possible ingenuity could secure by making artificial and uneconomical provision for them where they ought not to be.

J. H. TUKE.

ABOLITION OF LANDLORDS.

It may seem superfluous to English minds to discuss what appears to them so revolutionary a scheme as a general, compulsory, and immediate transfer of the land of Ireland from the landlords to the tenants. The idea has, however, not only gained a strong hold over the minds of the peasantry, but is even regarded with considerable favour by some advocates of the landlord's claims; while in England too there is probably an increasing body of opinion in large popular constituencies, if not within the walls of the House of Commons, in favour of drastic changes, the effect of which on the British taxpayer himself is not very clearly understood. It may, therefore, be worth while to inquire how the suggestion presents itself to Irish minds, what the results would be in Ireland, and whether the British taxpayer is likely to accept cheerfully the part assigned to him in the matter.

'Expropriation' is regarded by many thoughtful people in Ireland as the only possible alternative for a reform which should give to the tenant the practical security and joint interest in the land, which the scheme popularly called the three F's aims at affording him.

It is not merely that the relations between landlord and tenant are at present over a large portion of the West strained and disturbed, but the state of affairs has disclosed to many minds grave social dangers from the operation of the Land Laws, even under the protection given to the tenant by the Land Act of 1870, which were unsuspected by good landlords, but for which they are nevertheless suffering; to which, now they are known, many landlords are anxious to apply a remedy, and which amount to an extensive failure of the English system.

No one now denies that the State has a right itself to take possession of property by compulsory purchase at a price not less than the market value, where the public interests require such a transfer to be made. The State has also an unquestionable right to compel owners of property to sell to public bodies or other parties on similar conditions. The price in such cases has usually been calculated on a basis more liberal than that which the state of the market at a given moment under a forced sale would afford, and considerable allowance

has been made for the prospects of improvement in the market or the possibility of developing the property in question.

Landed property is no exception to the general principle; transfers of this kind constantly take place in the case of railways, streets, and in the furtherance of other public objects. And if a sufficient cause were shown, no principle can be laid down on which even a wholesale compulsory transfer of property in land should not be made from one class to another—always supposing that the latter are able to pay on the conditions stated above.

It may be desirable to point out that such a scheme differs from that connected with Mr. Bright's name, not only in the important point of compulsion, but also in the hardly less important respect of being wholesale and immediate—in fact, the difference is very much the same as that between reform and revolution.

It is not seriously contended by any party, except the Land League, that if such a change be desirable in Ireland it shall be effected at the expense of the class to be compelled to part with their property. Nor is it conceivable, either that the House of Commons would listen to such a proposal, or that any community, however democratic, which was not actually in the vortex of a revolution, would sanction such a formidable attack on the constitution of society, unless in the name of systematic communism. At any rate it is unnecessary at the present moment to entertain any such considerations or to discuss them in detail. And it may be assumed that any scheme of expropriation to be examined will not treat the whole body of Irish landlords as criminals to be visited with pains, penalties, or fines. General indictments are too much the fashion in these days in the country of Edmund Burke, forgetful of its great men of old; but an indictment against a whole class cannot claim much more respect or credit than one against a whole nation.

Supposing, however, for the sake of argument, that the Irish landlords, short of actual criminality, are so grasping and oppressive a class that justice and expediency require their entire and immediate abolition, what is the extent of the change contemplated, how is the change to be effected, and what are likely to be the consequences? And finally, is it practically possible?

The extent of the change socially is the removal from all connection with the land of 10,000 landlords, and the creation of 500,000 peasant proprietors. The pecuniary extent of the change is measured by Mr. Parnell's estimate of the rental of Ireland at 15,000,000*l.*, which at twenty-four years' purchase (the average price realised by the sale of lands to tenants in the Landed Estates Court) would represent a capital of 360,000,000*l.* Estimates of rental are not easy to verify, and certainly Mr. Parnell's estimate, placing the rental at 50 per cent. above Griffith's valuation, would be generally considered as much higher than the real figure. The common

impression among those who have considered the subject seems to be that the capital value of agricultural land in Ireland is something over 300,000,000*l*. This figure may for purposes of argument be used as sufficiently correct.

Three hundred millions! It is a sum 'imagination boggles at.' Where is it to come from? There has never been any answer given to this question but one—a Government loan. It is said, 'Oh, no money is required, nothing but paper, Government paper.' It is just as well, however, clearly to understand what is meant, and the operation of the proposed transaction. It is very simple. Government is to raise a loan, and advance to the tenants the whole, or part, of the capital sums, or Government stock, necessary to buy up the property. The landlords are to walk away with Government stock; the tenants are to repay the Government loan by instalments, which are to discharge principal and interest in a certain number of years, at the end of which time they will have their land rent free.

Postponing for a while the consideration of the scheme in detail, and supposing that it is perfectly feasible, just, and financially prudent for the three parties concerned, the State, the landlord, and the tenant, the important question arises, What are likely to be the consequences to those immediately interested? And here a larger field is included, for other classes must also be considered, especially the agricultural labourers, while such a gigantic change must have results for the whole community which it would be rash to attempt to forecast. Such a transaction cannot be viewed in a merely commercial light in its effects upon the two parties to the transfer, even though the class of agricultural tenants are, with their families, about half the population, nor as a matter of financial adjustment or actuarial calculation. It is, in fact, a question of high policy demanding the earnest thoughts of wisest statesmanship.

The points that specially demand attention are tolerably obvious, and may at any rate be indicated without presumption, despite the magnitude of the issues at stake and the sagacity which their determination demands.

The three classes who now divide the produce of the land occur first to the mind. These classes are naturally found in very various combinations in different parts of the country. In parts of Connaught there may be said to be only one class, that of small peasants—a separate class of labourers working for hire without land being absent, and few of the landlords being resident. In parts of Leinster, on the other hand, the farmer class proper is but scanty, the land being held in large grazing tracts by landlords or by graziers. And these exceptional conditions, as they may be considered, perhaps present the greatest difficulties in regard to this as also in regard to all other schemes of Land Reform. It is not intended, however,

on this occasion to discuss these peculiar circumstances, or do more than indicate their existence.

.Taking then the broad case of the greater part of the country where all three classes are found, what would be likely to be the effect on them?

I. On the landlords one effect is obvious—they would be ‘disestablished’ but not ‘disendowed’; in place of being ‘acred,’ they would be ‘consolled.’ It would be an exchange highly acceptable to many of the individuals now composing the class, if they suffered no diminution of income; and some might, perhaps, even think the security of the new position compensated for some reduction. It is often said, and has been boldly stated on public platforms to his constituents in Tipperary, by Mr. P. J. Smyth, that there would be a clear loss to the country of the rent-charges paid to Government, which would be sent out of Ireland instead of being spent in Ireland by the landlords. But this argument assumes that the landlords would all leave the country. If they remained, the State would be paying them interest which would be brought into the country, and would more or less balance the sum sent out of it by the quondam tenants in form of rent-charges paid to Government.

The great question is, therefore, whether the landlords would remain in the country? And there may be a difference of opinion as to the answer, both among those who would retain them in the country as resident gentry and among those who would wish them away as an alien aristocracy. Some would, doubtless, be induced to stay by interest in farming (they would of course retain their demesnes), love of sport, and other country pursuits; others by love of nature, attachment to their houses, their country, and the people amongst whom they were born and bred. It can scarcely be maintained that such residents could advantageously be dispensed with, and those who have lived among the Irish peasantry could hardly be persuaded that their room would be preferred to their company, while here and there a man might even cherish the hope that he might be more useful as a neighbour than as an autocrat. But when it is remembered that no definite and necessary duties would remain, and no tie bind them to the soil stronger than chance tastes or still more fleeting pleasures, it cannot but be feared that many would gravitate towards brighter skies or scenes of more various excitement, and become cosmopolitan, or at least metropolitan. Definite and necessary duties are what give true dignity to Irish country life, and self-imposed tasks can but rarely be depended upon to supply the same healthy stimulus. Every one knows the too frequent history of wasted powers and dissipated energies of the man who is ‘cursed with a competence,’ without duties or fixed occupation; and though there must always be disagreeables connected with the receiving of money by the richer class from the poorer, the desire on the part of the former to escape from

the position is sadly near the ignoble claim of 'rights without duties.' If the aristocratic idea as applied to land has to a great extent been found wanting in Ireland, in cases where the motto of 'noblesse oblige' has been forgotten, it will at any rate be admitted by all but professed revolutionists that every effort should be made to retain the service of a 'leisured class' in the community; and when its energies can no longer be utilised in respect of land, to direct their full force into channels in which they partly flow already—Poor Law, education, social and material improvement of the labouring classes, county government—where their true position would be as the natural leaders of a free people. Much may be done in furtherance of this object by a judicious reform of the Grand Jury system, by which at present the whole government of the county is carried on. But supposing the landlords suddenly removed from all connection with the land, no one could assert with any confidence that such occupations, which are also about to be modified in important particulars at this very moment, would be sufficient to induce them to remain. A doubt in such a matter would be serious, and it is difficult not to entertain even more than a doubt on the subject.

II. In considering the effect on the farmers, it is necessary to forestall one part of the financial question which was postponed. It may be assumed that no scheme could be applicable to a wholesale conversion of tenant farmers into occupying proprietors, which either required them to find a portion of the price, or increased the present liabilities of the existing tenants; for probably the majority of them would be absolutely unable to pay more than their present rent. The feasibility of a scheme which should fulfil this condition must be adverted to by-and-bye. It is sufficient for present purposes to lay down this axiom, which would be universally accepted in Ireland. What then would probably be the effect on the tenant farmer if, by some financial conjuring, the programme of the Land League could (without injustice to the landlord) be realised, of securing to him the fee simple of his farm rent free, after paying his present rent for thirty-five years?

The essence of the transaction is that the farmer gets something for nothing. The question whether it costs the State anything will come later. But there can be no doubt that the farmer under the supposed arrangement would get an enormous bonus, the difference between the present value of a terminable annuity payable for thirty-five years and the present value of the permanent rent liable to increase.

Now, without going into barren controversies as to the Celtic nature, or the historical, climatic, or other causes of national character, it may safely be said that, though the use of adversities may not always be sweet, the effect of a sudden and unexpected accession of good fortune on any nation or class will be demoralising. If it rained gold upon Ireland from another planet it would not be for the real advantage of the people. From the Greek wagoner, who prayed in

vain to Hercules until he put his own shoulder to the wheel, down to the beggar on horseback, who rode further than he bargained for, human effort has been blessed, and waiting upon fortune has been cursed even when fortune seemed most kind. If the sudden abrogation of landlords' duties seems of doubtful advantage to that class, surely the effect on the tenant class of a general windfall can be a matter of no doubt whatever.

But, it may be said, for thirty-five years the present rent must be paid; the existing tenants will get no windfall, and the security of possession will be such an incentive to industry that the rising generation will certainly grow up in habits of thrift. The magic of property will supply an unfailing stimulus when the rent-charge comes to an end in thirty-five years' time. The answer is that though the windfall is not an immediate possession in hand, it is there all the same, in the form of a deferred annuity as it were, or reversionary estate; and that it may be discounted in just the same way as the heir of an entailed estate may sell his reversionary interest before he succeeds. The vague and indefinite interest thus existing in expectancy would be too likely to be magnified in the imagination of the farmer, especially as it had been caused by no toil, and would even precipitate the ruin, which might otherwise be delayed until the son found himself rent free. Moreover, it is in expectancy also that the magic of property is most potent as a stimulus to labour. The peasant who by industry and thrift has a chance of becoming the owner of his house or his farm, or of buying such in the market, may well be expected to contribute to the stability of society, and to retain the habits by which he wins his way. But if, quite irrespective of industry and thrift, he is made a present of house or land, few, very few, would not be rather the worse than the better for the acquisition, and none, it may be confidently asserted, would develop these virtues under such circumstances, if they were not endowed with them already.

The principle of the Bright clauses is thoroughly sound, which demands an effort from the peasant who would become the owner of his land. Even here, perhaps, there is danger of the son being demoralised when, by his father's toil, he has his land rent free. But there is fair ground for hope that example and precept, during the struggle to pay off the rent-charge, may inaugurate habits that may be more or less hereditary. But if no special effort is demanded from the existing occupiers, and less than none from their children, what hope could there be? The magic in such cases would too probably be found a decidedly black art.

Nor under such circumstances could that improvement be looked for which should be the speedy consequence, in a half-developed country like Ireland, of any measure which secured to the cultivator absolutely the fruits of his labour, and which would be almost the best result that any legislation could have. Without the apprentice-

ship, too, of sustained and special effort, there would be much more reason to fear the reappearance of subletting and subdivision. A new land system might arise out of the ashes, but it would be impossible to say what form it might take.

Most people of experience in Ireland would say that a new race of most oppressive landlords would spring up; that if the old landlords chastised the people with whips, the new landlords would chastise them with scorpions. There is a pretty general impression abroad that the purchasers under the Landed Estates Court have been hard landlords, in fact rather land speculators than landlords. A remarkable confirmation of this idea will be found from comparing the number of such sales in different counties with the number of evictions and agrarian outrages. A table given by Mr. C. S. Roundell, now M.P. for Grantham, in a most interesting paper on 'Agrarianism,' in the *Fortnightly Review* of May 1871, shows that the counties where sales have been most numerous are among those which display the greatest number both of evictions and outrages. And when it is remembered that the proposal is by a wave of the wand to reduce the whole country to a dead level of petty proprietors, the risk of the worst possible form of 'landlordism' arising on a gigantic scale appears one that any statesman would shrink from. In every view, therefore, the dangers to the farming class from such a change would appear to be formidable, nor is it easy to see where they would end.

III. Coming now to the labourers, it is obvious that any change which tended to diminish the number of resident gentry would be a direct pecuniary loss to them, whatever it might be to the farmers, and apart from any social advantages which might be curtailed by the disappearance of the upper class. The cases are already not few in which during this winter landlords have been obliged either to reduce, or put down altogether, their demesne expenditure in labour, owing to their rents being unpaid: while the works of drainage, &c., initiated under the special loans of last winter, which were of immense value in some parts of the country, have been suspended in many places owing to the same causes, landlords naturally hesitating to charge their properties with loans, for the improvement of their tenants' farms, in face of an organised resistance to the payment of contracted rents. This danger was not overlooked by Mr. Parnell, who, towards the end of his autumn campaign, strongly urged the tenants themselves to employ extra labour, where they had withheld their rents from the landlords. It may be doubted whether his advice would have been followed to any extent, but it is not likely just at present to be put to the test; for if, as seems to be intended, public relief works are to be again set on foot this year, the relief will extend to the Land League, which will have removed from its shoulders the responsibility of finding work for those whom the land-

lords were forced to throw out of employment. Public relief works, however, cannot be resorted to by any Government unless in time of exceptional distress; they would certainly not be thought of at a time of wholesale transfer of land from one class to another.

But, supposing the same change, which diminished the employment given by landlords, also removed or weakened the stimulus to industry on the part of the farmer, the labourers would (failing public relief works) suffer a double loss. •

Nor can we even console ourselves with the hope that the Land League organisation would remain as a beneficent despotism for the protection of the labourer, by combating the interests of the class that gave it birth, and insisting on their employing labour. On the contrary, the probable result would be a labour trades-union for the purpose of extracting their rights from the farmer, beginning by claiming work for fair wages, and tempted, perhaps, before long, to better the instruction of the Land League, and ask for wages without work.

No greater boon could be conferred on all classes of the country than if, by putting the acquisition of land, by strenuous effort, within the reach of the peasantry, the stimulus to industry were quickened and invigorated. This would at once afford bracing education to the farmer, encourage the employment of agricultural labourers and artisans, develop trade, and last, not least, give increased stability to the whole social system. But all these benefits would be imperilled, if not actually reversed, if the prize were dropped into the mouth.

Again, if the whole agricultural land of the country were transferred at one sweep to the farmer, the chances of the labourers now without land obtaining any would be worse than ever.

There is a clause in the Land Act of 1870 enabling the landlord to take up any portion of a farm, not exceeding one twenty-fifth part, for the purpose of building labourers' cottages, with or without allotments, without being liable to any claim for compensation for disturbance. This provision has been, so far as the present writer can ascertain, almost inoperative; but from whatever cause the failure has arisen, the intention of the Legislature was clearly to make some provision for the improvement of the labourers' position, and the endeavour should now be to extend this provision and make it more effective, certainly not to cut off all possibility of achieving the purpose. The Land Act of 1870 (whatever may have been the intention of its authors) practically gave the tenants, where tenant-right did not exist, some kind of proprietary interest in the soil. The principle of the clause in question is to exempt from any such claim land (up to one twenty-fifth part of the whole) required for labourers. In other words, a *locus standi* is clearly given to the labourers, on an equal footing with the farmers, as claimants for a limited portion of

the soil. In any scheme for transferring the land^f from landlord to tenant, such a principle should equally find a place. But if the proposal were to make the transfer summary and compulsory, the labourers' claim would be doubly strong, because of the uncertainties attaching to such a violent change. It is *possible*, for instance, that if the demand for employment increased, labourers might be able to save and buy small plots of land. Such a result would be eminently desirable. But it is quite impossible to say whether aggregation and consolidation might not prevail over other tendencies, and prevent such a process. And if it is said that the arrangement and apportionment of the land should be left to free-trade and the working of economic laws, the reply is that the scheme now being discussed is very far from free-trade, and that if there is to be State interference in the interest of the tenant, or of any class or classes, the labourers have an equal claim to consideration.

The agricultural labourers cannot be estimated at a figure much below the number of tenant farmers. The majority of these probably have not as much land as 'the place of a head of cabbage,' in the common phrase. This condition has been repeatedly pronounced by commissions and high authorities, private and official, to be most unsatisfactory. But though there might be much difference of opinion as to the means by which their acquisition of land might be encouraged, there would be general agreement that no effort should be spared by the Legislature to facilitate such an object, while any measure to exclude them would not only be condemned by most thoughtful minds, but might lead to serious conflict between labourers and farmers.

It must be remembered, moreover, that the Irish labourer is unrepresented in Parliament. The Irish labourer has no vote even in cities and boroughs, and the compact and energetic party in the House of Commons, which declaims in the name of 'the Irish people,' represent mainly the single, though important, class of tenant farmers. At present the sympathy of the working classes of England, while reprobating outrage, is enlisted on the side of the tenants as against the landlords; and, Irish labourers having for the present thrown in their lot with the Land League, the English public is too likely to forget their existence, and that their interests may be affected almost as much as those of the other two classes by legislation on the Land Laws.

IV. But it must not be forgotten, after adverting to the probable effect of change upon the agricultural classes, that, though Ireland is mainly agricultural, there are of course other classes and interests which it is the anxious desire of statesmen of all parties to foster and develop. Any sweeping change in the Land Laws would exercise a proportionately greater effect on their interest than in a country like England, where agriculture does not hold the same position of pre-eminent and almost exclusive importance.

And the consequences we have been contemplating, as likely to result to the agricultural classes from 'expropriation,' must certainly react most powerfully, not only on the medical and legal professions, and the voluntary Protestant Church (which latter would probably disappear altogether), but also upon trade and commerce, and artisan labour. The three latter interests could hardly fail to benefit by a gradual growth of peasant proprietary, which should be the goal of industry and intelligence. But with an upper class diminished, if not destroyed, a demoralised middle class, and a disappointed lower class with nothing to lose, such interests could hardly fail to suffer. This branch of the inquiry is too complicated to be further pursued here; nor is it intended to discuss the political aspects of the question, though it would be well to remember that it has been stated on high authority in Ireland that this agitation is only the prelude to Home Rule, while in America there is no attempt at concealing that the real end in view is complete separation.

Reverting now to the question of the feasibility of the scheme financially, it will be remembered that it was assumed above that no such scheme could be generally carried into effect which increased the present liabilities of the existing tenants, or required them to find a portion of the purchase-money. What does this lead to? The sales to tenants of their farms, effected in the Landed Estates Court to March 1878, average $24\frac{1}{10}$ years' purchase of the rent. It is improbable that, if Parliament were forcing a sale, the rate would, under these circumstances, be less than 25 years' purchase. Suppose the case of a farm rented at 40*l.* a year. The landlord's compensation in case of expropriation would at this rate be 1,000*l.* It was calculated in 1870 that the lowest rate of interest, at which money could be advanced by the State to tenants for purchasing their farms, was $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., or a terminable rent-charge of 5 per cent. to pay off principal and interest in thirty-five years. The interest on 1,000*l.* at 5 per cent. is 50*l.*; but by hypothesis the tenant is not to pay more than his present rent. The State, then, must lose 10*l.* per thousand or 1 per cent. for thirty-five years; 1 per cent. on 300 millions is 3,000,000*l.* a year, which is about equivalent to 2*d.* on the income tax. This is supposing the national credit to be unchanged.

But it is sometimes argued that Government can raise money much cheaper now than ten years ago. Consols are nearly at par; the conversion of 3 per cents. into stock at a lower interest has been much discussed of late; the State will probably be able to advance to the Irish tenant at less than $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., and the repayment of principal might be spread over a longer period of years, so as by this double change to reduce the terminable rent-charge to the same level as the present rent. As to extending the period of repayment, no responsible statesman would be likely to let it much exceed a genera-

tion, or to prolong the time during which the State would practically be landlord. As to reduction of interest, there seems to be some doubt whether even Mr. Gladstone's financial genius can effect any considerable change at present; but one thing is quite certain, that such a change could not take place concurrently with the raising of a loan of 300 millions, which would be an addition to the National Debt of 38 per cent. The reason that consols have been rising for several years is, roughly speaking, that there is more capital seeking the highest class of investment than Government desires to borrow. The demand for consols is in excess of the supply. But suppose the supply suddenly increased 38 per cent., and it is obvious that the price of consols must fall, or, in other words, the rate of interest must rise.

No less an authority than the present Postmaster-General, Professor Fawcett, has shown most clearly and conclusively the results that would follow such an operation as the 'nationalisation of the land' advocated by the 'International Society,' and which meant the purchase by the State, as landlord, of the whole land of the country.

He estimated the capital for such a purpose at 4,500 millions, the raising of which he calculated would increase the rate of interest at which Government could borrow to at least $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. If the raising of 300 millions did no more than counteract the gradual decrease in the rate now going on, the minimum loss to the State would, as we have seen, be three millions a year for thirty-five years. It is needless to ask whether the taxpayers of England and Scotland are prepared to bear such a burden. They certainly could not be asked to do so by any Irishman who respected himself or his country, and it may be observed by the way that if Ireland stood by herself, with an independent exchequer and financial system, the operation would not only be questionable for the Irish taxpayers, but wholly impracticable financially.

But this is not all. The payment of the rent-charge depends on the industry and solvency of the tenant, on good or bad seasons, on prices of agricultural produce. No portion of it could be omitted by the State except at the expense of the general taxpayers; and consequently in the case of the Church tenants, who bought their holdings with money advanced by the State, no abatement could be given, or has been given during the recent bad years. The security for the payment of the instalments is of course the land acquired by the tenant, on which the State loan is a first charge. The instalments have been paid even in the last year with very few exceptions, but it must have been in many cases with money borrowed at ruinously high interest, or by some sacrifice of capital in form of live stock or otherwise. But failing payment, the State must clearly realise its security and sell the land. So long as the number of such mortgages is relatively small, or increasing only gradually, the security is amply

sufficient. But a wholesale conversion would give a dangerous handle to agitation, and without an almost absolute certainty that the debt would not be repudiated or an agitation, Parliamentary or otherwise, got up for abatement or remission, could any Government venture upon such a policy? And if the prize were obtained without effort, the danger would be increased. If the State made occupiers a present once, they would be the less backward in making renewed applications; once the self-respect of any class is broken down by eleemosynary grants of public money, systematic mendicity is not far off. The remainder of the cake would be always there: 'cut and come again' would become the national motto. It has been too common for members of many classes in Ireland to go a-begging of Government and Parliament. And this is due in great measure to the system of 'sops' that has been often pursued. It is time this system were succeeded by careful study of the nature and wants of the country, and the application of well-considered remedies; it would be mischievous to extend it at all, but on such a scale absolutely disastrous.

Finally, is there sufficient cause for incurring all these risks? Are the Irish landlords generally so grasping and oppressive that justice and expediency require their entire and immediate abolition? Putting aside the small class of professed revolutionists, it is hardly conceivable that the individual tenants desire to drive their landlords out of the country. Their object at first was security and an end to the conflicting interests of the two classes, which has grown, under the influence of agitation, into what is practically at bottom, as Mr. Parnell says, a demand for the reduction of rent. Amongst landlords and others outside the tenant class, who advocate the proposal, it is on the broad ground that the differences between landlord and tenant are irreconcilable, and there is nothing for it but heroic remedies. On both sides it is chiefly a feeling of impatience and irritation at the present dissensions. But two considerations are here worth notice.

First, that the land system cannot have been practically so iniquitous as it is frequently described, or the country so highly inflammable as its present state seems to indicate. The land agitation began in Mayo in April 1879, and yet in spite of the distress of the following summer and winter, and the vigorous agitation that was carried on, it can hardly be said to have spread beyond Mayo and Galway during that year; and it required a good deal of petroleum to be pumped on the rest of the edifice to set it on fire this year. If the Land Laws were universally oppressive, and the relations of landlord and tenant hopelessly irreconcilable, a single match would have been sufficient to set the whole country in a blaze. Mr. Forster has alluded in the House of Commons to the state of Limerick as being specially significant. That county during 1879 and the early part of last year enjoyed a happy immunity from agitation. Last summer the relations of landlord and tenant were undisturbed, rents were

being well paid, evictions (which were increasing over the country as a whole) decreased, and during the first 8 months of the year the agrarian outrages were 20 in number. Parliament was prorogued in the beginning of September, and in that month and October there was a decided increase of agrarian outrages in the west; in Limerick they numbered 32, making 52 in all for the 10 months; of these, however, only one was an offence against the person. On the 1st of November a monster demonstration was organised in Limerick in Mr. Parnell's honour, which was followed by a rapid development of Land League branches and meetings all over the country, and in that one month the outrages numbered 59, more than the total of the preceding 10 months, and of these 4 were offences against the person. In December they rose to 75, of which 3 were against the person. Such figures require no comment.

The *second* consideration is that nothing has yet been done, either to restore order, or to remedy the admitted defects of the Land Laws and give security to the tenants. Till order and reform have both been given an opportunity of obtaining the desired result, it would be highly unstatesmanlike to rush to extreme conclusions. Many Liberal Irishmen believe that the object may be gained by a firm adherence to these two lines of policy, and if they should prove right in their opinion, many even of their opponents will rejoice.

To sum up: a wholesale 'expropriation' of landlords appears, on an appeal to moderate arguments and generally recognised principles, to offer more difficulties and dangers than compensating advantages—to promise emigration of landlords, or exclusion from national life if they remain—demoralisation of tenant farmers—and very probable injury to the labourers. It would inflict certain financial loss on the State in the first instance, and the possibility of more serious evils in the future: it would be a revolution for which there is no sufficient cause.

Extend the Bright clauses and make them really operative, and you will, with the almost unanimous support of all parties, effect on a sound financial basis a gradual change in land tenure which will be at once an education to the occupier, and a source of strength and stability to the community. Any such measure will necessarily leave out the worst and most helpless cases; and these last can only be dealt with by giving adequate security to the tenant in some form or other, which will probably necessitate an appeal to the Court in disputes as to rent. But wholesale expropriation only lands you in the inevitable dilemma that if the occupier cannot make the effort necessary to buy up the rent, the difference must come out of the pocket, either of the landlord, or of the general taxpayer; and as the first alternative may be postponed until Home Rule is granted, and the second, if possible, to a still more distant period, the scheme may, on the whole, be regarded as not only mischievous but impracticable.

THE IRISH POLICE.

THE unsatisfactory state of Ireland brings into relief the machinery for the prevention and detection of crime in that country. When we find a great increase of a kind of crime always present to a greater or lesser degree, we are likely to be driven to the conclusion that the Irish police system is bad; or that the members of the force are not faithfully discharging their duty; or that the causes of crime lie so deep that it cannot effectually be reached by any police system based on lines of British freedom.

The origin of the English constable dates back probably five hundred years before the Norman Conquest. 'Constable' is a compound name of comparatively modern date, but the 'borseholder, or borough-elder,' has preserved his title unchanged from the early Saxon times; the Saxon word borge, borrow, or borhoe signifying a pledge, and calder the chief or head man of the pledges. This Teutonic police system of guild or tithing is so well known that it requires but a passing mention. The male inhabitants were joined in sections of ten men, who became mutually security for the good conduct of each other. The section, or 'tithing,' elected one of their number to answer for them, and probably invested him with a certain amount of authority over them in arranging the proportion to be paid, by each, of the amercements that might be imposed upon the tithing for murder or robbery committed by one of their number. This man so elected was called the borrow-elder, or, in other words, the chief of the pledge. Each group of ten tithings then became a hundred which was in a lesser degree responsible in so far that a fine too large to be paid by a tithing was chargeable to the hundred. Any man not enrolled as a member of a tithing became an outlaw, and for his murder no fine could be exacted by his relatives. The system of Peace-Pledge is admirably traced by Pike in his *History of Crime in England*. It is evident that if offences against the peace could have been tried by tribunals independent of the hundred, the system would offer the most ample safeguards. But its benefits were obliterated by the form of trial. If the fellow tithing men of the accused swore that they believed him innocent he escaped punishment, and they averted the imposition of a fine, of which each one of them

must have paid a portion. This trial by compurgation was not trial by jury. The compurgators were simply witnesses to character before the lord in whose court the offender was tried, but the effect of their unanimous declaration of belief in his innocence was precisely that of a verdict of 'not guilty' by a jury. Down to the middle of the fourteenth century, the establishment of these courts was entirely at the discretion of the lord of the soil, the borrow-elder being a deputy from the tithing, and an executive officer of the law as declared by the lord or his steward. But about that time the increased power of the towns enabled them to resist the claims of any lord to interfere in their affairs; they established their own police, and public opinion set in strongly against private justice. When parishes were formed for the more regular collection of tithes and distribution to the poor, the borrow-elder became in most places the parish constable, and continues to this day, elected by the parishioners or churchwardens to assist the county constabulary instituted under a new system. The English parish constable thus represents the principle of minute local government carried down from days long anterior to the Norman Conquest. The police system of Ireland has not so grown with the growth of the people. The first mention of constables that I can find is in the 10 Hen. VII., when it was enacted that every subject must have an English bow and a sheaf of arrows, or a jack fallot, and that the men in daily service of lords, knights, and esquires must be supplied with those weapons. Two wardens of the peace were to be appointed to every barony, and in every parish 'constables of able persons, inhabitants within said parish,' who were to have a pair of butts erected, and to see that on holidays every man was to shoot two or three games or pay a fine of three pence. This enactment of 1495 evidently extended only to the portions of Ireland inhabited by Englishmen, and in 1495 large territories were still unconquered.

This is shown by the statutes of 1566. The 3 & 4 Ph. and My., an Act prohibiting the unlicensed distillation of whisky, began thus: 'Forasmuch as *aqua vitæ*, a drink nothing profitable to be daily drunken and used, is now universally throughout the realm of Ireland made, and especially in the *borders of the Irishry*, &c.;' and the last struggle of Hugh O'Neill was not over until the beginning of the seventeenth century. The extension of baronies and parishes then continued until the whole country was so divided.

It is probable that during the seventeenth century the parish constable, like the parish clergyman, was changed with changing reigns, reforming with Henry and Elizabeth; becoming Catholic with Mary; Protestant with Cromwell; again oscillating between James and William. The struggle of 1690 settled the religion of the parish constables for a century, and the 27th Geo. III. chap. 40, authoris-

ing the grand jury to appoint sixteen petty constables for each barony or half barony, ordained that these constables must be Protestants.

Thus far we find that the system of police in Ireland has been a purely English institution, introduced at first for the benefit of the English settlers within the Pale. At this time the penal laws against Roman Catholicism were in force, and it is improbable that these constables, exclusively Protestants, would have been regarded by the Catholic people otherwise than as the instruments of persecution. As preservers of the peace they were useless. They did not even satisfactorily execute criminal warrants, which were frequently executed by private persons with the aid of the troops or yeomanry. They became practically hangers-on to different magistrates, who used them more often as workmen or messengers than as constables, and to whom they brought from time to time scraps of information gathered from the conversation of the people, by whom they were as distrusted as they were disliked.

Their uselessness as preservers of the peace was quickly demonstrated, but it was not until 1814 that a peace preservation force was formed in parts of Ireland. This force had no cohesion. Under the Peace Preservation Act the Lord Lieutenant could proclaim any county or city to be in a state of disturbance. These parts of the country were divided into districts, each placed for police purposes under the control of a chief magistrate. A number of the peace preservation force were placed under the orders of the chief magistrate, who made what changes he pleased in their drill, discipline, and uniform.

The following description of a turn-out of the peace preservation force is from the *History of the Irish Constabulary*, by Mr. Curtis, an old constabulary officer. A brother officer told him as follows:—

I was standing at assize time in the street of Maryborough (a town only fifty miles from Dublin) near the hotel, when I heard the sound of horsemen rapidly approaching, and suddenly a body of forty men came sweeping round the corner at a sharp trot, scarcely giving me time to get out of their way. They drew up opposite the hotel, under the command of a Major Nicholson, who was commandant of so much of the peace preservation force as were in the province of Leinster. This officer wore a dark blue jacket, closely braided in front with round black silk cord, and small buttons; red cuffs and collar, red and gold lace girdle, and tall beaver cap and feathers, with crescent Turkish-shaped scimitar. Of the men, ten wore scarlet cloaks over their uniform, reaching down over their horses' tails, brass helmets and plumes, 'Waterloo' on the helmets; ten were in hussar uniforms, with loose jackets slung over the shoulder, hussar saddles with sheepskins, &c. Ten others were in a uniform which I cannot now describe, but sitting behind them on pads were voltigeurs with short rifles resting on the thigh. These voltigeurs were made to dismount and remount occasionally by their eccentric commander.

The inconvenience of this system was apparent. The force only existed in proclaimed districts, and it was the interest of magistrates and men that the crime and outrage should not be entirely suppressed.

A member of the force transferred from one proclaimed district to another found himself under different conditions of drill and work, and each transfer necessitated fresh instruction. However, during the serious troubles of 1816, 1817, and 1818, the peace preservation force so completely failed that in 1822 an Act was passed authorising the formation of a constabulary force of 5,000 men. The Lord Lieutenant appointed an inspector-general for each of the four provinces; the appointment of officers was also in his hands. The power to appoint the constables was given to the magistrates, and for the first time since the battle of the Boyne Catholics were enrolled as constables for the preservation of the peace. In this form the force continued for thirteen years, during which it performed efficient service. Faction fights were then of frequent occurrence, as many as a thousand people on each side being sometimes engaged. In May 1831 a number of police under the command of my father, then chief constable in Westmeath, interfered to stop a faction fight at Castlepollard. Both sides attacked the police, who were at last obliged to fire upon them, killing thirteen and wounding a great number. In June, the same year, seventeen people were killed and many wounded by yeomanry, who turned out in support of the police at Newtownbarry, where the people attempted to rescue cattle seized for tithes. Again in December at Carrickshock an attack was made upon thirty constabulary who refused to deliver up a process server whom they were protecting. Here the people were successful. A volley was fired by the constabulary, by which two of their assailants were killed; before they could reload the people were upon them; fourteen men with their officer were killed, and eight badly wounded.

The evils resulting from a difference of system in the four provinces led to the ultimate amalgamation of the force, and in 1836 the constabulary was reorganised under the provisions of the 6 & 7 Wm. IV. chap. 13. The provincial inspectors-general were done away with, and the entire force amalgamated. The Irish constabulary now consisted of an inspector-general, a deputy, and two assistant inspectors-general, who formed the head-quarter staff; 35 county inspectors, 217 sub-inspectors, and, in round numbers, 10,000 constables and men; and, fluctuating between that number and 12,000 men, it has continued practically without change for forty-four years.

By this Act the constabulary ceased to be a local force. The appointment of constables no longer rested with the magistrates; but no candidate was accepted who was not recommended by a magistrate, or an officer of the force. A certain number of constables were allocated to each county, half the expense of which force was to be borne by the county, half by the consolidated fund. If the magistrates of any county required additional men over the complement, the county was to be charged with the entire expense of such addi-

tional force. A reserve force of 200 men was formed at the central depôt in Dublin and paid for out of the consolidated fund; and it may be stated at once that, a few years later on, the entire cost of the Irish constabulary was made an Imperial charge, save for the extra number required for counties in a disturbed state, thus relieving the Irish taxpayers of the payment of over 1,100,000*l.* sterling per annum.

I have so far endeavoured to point out the difference in the growth of police systems in England and in Ireland. A police force is theoretically the internal executive power established by a civil society of free men, united together for mutual protection, and acknowledging mutual rights and duties. Such a power, so established, must of necessity be supported by the majority of the community, on whose active assistance in the execution of legislative decrees the constable can count. This describes accurately the position of the constable in England. Now let us imagine such a civil society conquered and annexed by another community whose legislative decrees are different, and whose opinions on matters of internal rights of person or property are divergent. Let us further suppose a portion of the conquering community settled among the conquered. At first their settlement is a purely military matter, leaving out of account the society that has been annexed. Then as numbers follow, and the conquerors are firmly established, they adopt the legislative views and the police power they left at home. Little by little they absorb the lands of the conquered society; a large number even adopt its views. But the regulations for the internal conduct of the weak society are formed upon the public opinion of the strong; so far as its members are concerned the executive power is not of their making, and does not represent the outcome of their mutual agreement for protection.

This represents pretty fairly the establishment of police in Ireland. The laws regulating its internal affairs and dealing with the security of person and property are laws that satisfy the English conscience. For centuries the Irish people doggedly refused to be bound by English laws, however beneficial; and of all the seven hundred years since the landing of Strongbow not sixty have elapsed since the Celtic Irishman was first admitted to the office of petty constable.

It is not, then, surprising that before 1822 the constable was regarded with great disfavour. The executive power was practically in the hands of the yeomanry—a body, if tradition be true, whose cruelties in 1797 were only equalled by their weakness in 1798—and the constables were regarded as their jackals. The establishment of the Irish constabulary secured a force strong enough to overcome any opposition from a society however lawless; with a thorough knowledge of the people, from whom they were drawn; and animated by a sympathy that demanded their friendship, while faithfully and

efficiently discharging duties never faithfully and 'efficiently discharged in Ireland before.

The end and object of a police force is the prevention of crime and the detection of offenders. A police force succeeds or fails in proportion to the amount of crime prevented or detected, and its success or failure must be gauged by its success in prevention as much as by the sum of its detection.

But the duties of the Irish constabulary are by no means confined to its duties as a police force pure and simple. Leaving out of account their duties as to the prevention or detection of crime, the police have to act as water-bailiffs; look after the safety of the roads; remove cattle found wandering, and summon for road nuisance; serve summons for attendance of jurors at assizes; the same at quarter-sessions; act as game preservers under the Poaching Prevention Act; collect the census statistics; collect annually the agricultural statistics; issue and collect voting papers for the election of poor-law guardians; execute loan fund warrants; keep a register of all houses in the district, number of forges, number of carts available for troops in case of emergency, number of licensed dogs; look after the suppression of illicit distillation; and dozens of other duties not dreamt of by an English policeman. In fact, to understand what their duties are, one need only add together the duties of every person in England connected with the collection of statistics, the preservation of fish or game, the supervision of the roads, and the business of the police. Everything in Ireland, from the muzzling of a dog to the suppression of a rebellion, is done by the Irish constabulary.

No policeman in Europe receives the same amount of theoretical training for his duties. The recruit having been accepted after his antecedents and those of his family have been inquired into, and an examination passed in reading and writing, he spends six months at the dépôt in Dublin, where he learns as much drill as will enable him to use properly the arms with which he is supplied for emergency, and prevent a number of men assembled in discharge of their duty from being a mere armed mob. Each day he is instructed by an experienced head constable in the various branches of his duty. Crimes, with their possible motives, are gone over, and broad lines of action in certain cases are mapped out, and by the time he has learned his drill he is thus well grounded in theoretical knowledge of his duty. Here his instruction differs from that of any other police force of which I know. Nothing is left to be learnt by rule of thumb. His powers and his duties are regularly taught to him, and, if he has an opinion on cases that come under his notice, he must be prepared to give legal reasons for the faith that is in him. Hereafter as a trained policeman he may be sent to the north of Ireland, or to the south. He may never be stationed in his own county. He is thus saved the awkwardness of having to perform duties, often

unpleasant, among those who have been his friends and companions. He is paid from 20*s.* to 24*s.* a week. A constable's pay is 7*l.* a year, and a head constable's 90*l.* to 101*l.* All have in addition lodging, clothing, and firing. This rate of pay is far beyond what an ordinary farmer's son could hope to earn, and the force offers every inducement for success in bringing offenders to justice.

Passing over the prevention of crime for the present, let us examine the probabilities of detection in Ireland. There are two kinds of detectives besides the men in large towns who wear no uniform so that they may not appear remarkable, but are well known as policemen. I shall call them the English and the foreign types. The English typical detective is a policeman in plain clothes, clever in the collection of materials from which a chain of evidence can be woven, quick in the appreciation of the smallest items of information, with a good memory for faces, and a genius for possible causes of outrage, or probable subsequent action of a known criminal. The foreign type is the man or woman in society, or the baker, or butcher, or servant, or criminal, in the pay of the police, and is a spy pure and simple. Of such a one it may be accepted as a truism that the man who spends his life in deceiving those with whom he comes in contact will have little compunction in deceiving his employers—the Government—if it be his interest to do so. The utility of the English type, on the other hand, depends very much upon the readiness or truthfulness with which his inquiries are answered. At the same time there is in England a superstition that a detective can discover anything if he only likes, and the supposed failure of detection in Ireland is accepted as a proof of the failure of the police.

The following case will illustrate the difficulties attending the detection of agrarian crimes:—

A man has been murdered, and it is generally known that his life has been taken in consequence of some action of his respecting a farm lately come into his occupation. There is but little difficulty in saying who murdered him. Everybody in the neighbourhood mentions his name in a whisper to each other, but will not open their lips to a stranger. A policeman hears the circumstances from a friend, who tells him without reserve the entire story of the concoction of the plot, and possibly the amount of money paid to the murderer. The policeman, being energetic and anxious, after trying to induce him to come forward as a witness, compels him to come before a magistrate for examination. In answer to the justice the person says he knows nothing of the matter, and only told the policeman what he heard somebody say in a fair. He does not even know the man who said it. He is sworn, and repeats this statement; and now, if he came forward to-morrow, his evidence would be worthless, for his sworn denial of its truth is recorded. It would be difficult to formulate a plan by which this man could be compelled to

6
speak the truth. If he did, he would either be obliged to expatriate himself, or to live for years under the protection of the police. A detective—for there are detectives in Ireland—has been for some time in that neighbourhood. He is possibly a butcher, or drover, or labourer. He has heard the murderer himself acknowledge the crime. Here one may assume that justice will be done. But such a detective would only be accepted as an informer; and it is an inflexible rule that the evidence of an informer is worthless except so far as it is corroborated by untainted evidence, or by circumstances. The effect of bringing forward the detective of the neighbourhood would be that while the prisoner would be acquitted, the detective would be useless for the future, and the valuable preventive information that he might hereafter glean would be lost. As to any stranger, policeman or otherwise, obtaining information, it is impossible. Unfortunately, not one in five hundred of the community, be he gentleman or peasant, looks upon the commission of crime upon another as a matter affecting anybody but the Government. It is entirely a matter for the police, and neither the desire for security nor the temptation of a large reward will induce any person to offer assistance. I know myself a man who was an involuntary witness to a murder. He is penniless; his wildest dream of wealth probably never went beyond the possession of ten pounds. Two thousand pounds were offered to him if he would divulge the terrible secret of the murder. He refused. He was asked to name his own sum. He answered that life was sweet, and prefers eking out a wretched existence to braving the danger of giving evidence. It is thus not strange that detection, or rather conviction, of crime in Ireland is difficult, but that any convictions can be obtained where society seems to have lost the instinct of self-preservation. It is worthy of remark that in cases of murder in England, committed by Irishmen upon Irishmen, the English police are powerless. No clue has been discovered in either the case of the Sheffield murder or the late assassination at Solihull. These murders bore the marks of being the work of a society; but there, as in Ireland, accomplices can hold their tongues.

I have hitherto not spoken of the details of the Irish constabulary system. The head-quarter staff is composed of an inspector-general, a deputy, and three assistants, who inspect the stations from time to time in the different counties. Each county is commanded by a county inspector, and is divided into districts, each in charge of a sub-inspector. The districts are in turn divided into from eight to twelve sub-districts, each in charge of a constable, who has four or five sub-constables stationed with him. There are 1,415 such stations in Ireland; and as the total area of the island, independent of lakes, is 20,192,186 acres, the average acreage of each sub-district is 14,270 statute acres. A few of the officers are promoted from

the ranks, but the large majority have entered as cadets by competitive examination. The pay, including allowances, is—Inspector-general, 1,500*l.*; deputy-inspector general, 1,000*l.*; assistants, 600*l.* to 800*l.*; county inspectors, 500*l.* to 650*l.*; sub-inspectors, 250*l.* to 450*l.* The pay of the lower grades I have given before. The force is absolutely homogeneous, and promotion is by seniority independent of counties, with power of rejection. The regulations as to the guidance of the force are identical to the minutest detail; and the sub-constable in the wilds of Donegal will answer the same questions in the constables' daily examination as to his knowledge of police duties, get up at the same hour, parade at the same time, and fold his barrack-bedding in exactly the same pattern as his brother stationed in the quiet glens of Wicklow or the troubled city of Cork.

Every outrage occurring in the sub-district is verbally reported without delay to the nearest local magistrate, and a written report sent to the sub-inspector, who visits the scene and reports in triplicate to the inspector-general, the county inspector, and the resident magistrate. All complaints go through the sub-inspector to the county inspector, who transmits them to the inspector-general. In cases of serious outrage the county inspector is supposed to visit the place and see that no necessary steps have been neglected; and the telegraph is at the service of any policeman who may require to send a telegram on police service. This system has many advantages; for in the flux and reflux of large numbers of men—now to the north to keep party processions from each other's throats, now to the west to protect process servers from the attentions of an angry peasantry, possibly to the south to meet more serious troubles—the different parts of a heterogeneous force would be all at sea. The interchangeability of the men is useful in another way, for men who have served in towns and become acquainted with the criminal classes there congregated may know them when they set out upon a tour of mischief. I remember a case in Belfast where a serious crime was committed by two men who escaped from the town. Two hundred notices were printed, and sent to every station in the north of Ireland, naming one man and describing both. Next day a sub-constable in a country station thirty miles away who had been stationed in Belfast, recognised one of the men, and both were captured. In England a criminal from London, Liverpool, or Birmingham, who takes the precaution of leaving his own town, is safe from recognition except he happens to meet a detective from the place.

I have said that a police force must be judged by its preventive action as well as by the sum of its detection. Putting the former aside, I find, on examining hard facts, that the Royal Irish Constabulary can afford to base its claims on its detection alone. I have before me the following Blue Books:—(1) '*Judicial Statistics, England and Wales, 1879*;' (2) '*Police, Counties and Boroughs, 1879*;'

(3) 'Report of the Commissioners of the Police of the Metropolis, 1879 ;' (4) 'Statistical Tables of the Dublin Metropolitan Police, 1879 ;' (5) 'Return Agrarian and other Crimes (Ireland).' The first four returns give identical tables for 1879, so far as indictable offences go, and are, therefore, on all fours for purposes of comparison. The fifth is a Parliamentary return of indictable offences in Ireland from the 1st of May 1878, to the 31st of December 1879. In the want of method in its compilation, and the paucity of information given, the return compares very unfavourably with the exhaustive reports presented yearly by every English county and borough, as with the information contained in the Dublin police report. The Irish crime report merely states the crimes, and does not separate indictable crimes tried at petty sessions from those in which the persons made amenable were discharged or committed for trial. The other reports make this distinction, and I have extracted from the Irish report the materials for a similar table. For purposes of comparison of averages it does not much matter that the Irish report covers six months' longer time. There are two offences in the Irish return that have no place in the English tables. They are threatening letters and riots ; one being by its nature as impossible to detect, as identification is certain in the other. Of the 5,526 offences mentioned in the return no less than 900 are threatening letters, and 60 riots or assaults on police, for which 580 persons were made amenable. Both these offences I deduct from the return, as I also put aside 339 cases in which 650 persons were made amenable but tried at petty sessions, as is the custom in Ireland whenever possible, and fines under five pounds imposed, or imprisonment under two months inflicted. This leaves the number of indictable offences 4,227, for which 2,508 persons have been made amenable.

I give in the table on the opposite page the same information for the several districts of England and Wales, and for Dublin, with the average percentage of detection for each district. I distinguish the reports from which the figures are extracted by the numbers I., II., III., &c., and give the pages as far as possible.

The table speaks for itself. I have added the statistics for a couple of English and a couple of Irish seaports whose populations approach equality. It must be remembered that there is a larger police force in the Irish towns in proportion to population, but still the disproportion in percentage of apprehensions is very striking. Taking the three great districts of England—the London Metropolitan, the London City, and the Dublin Metropolitan police districts—and comparing them with the efficiency of the Royal Irish Constabulary, it will be seen that the force is second of the seven in its average of apprehensions. I do not wish to load this paper with more statistics ; but I find, deducting the same class of offences as in the other case, that in 269 agrarian crimes reported in the same time 120 persons, or 45·6 per cent., were made amenable.

	Blue Book	Population	Number of Polices	Number of Crimes	Number of Persons apprehended	Average percent.
Eastern Counties, Midland, and North Wales district	II. p. 117, { p. 14	5,558,593	4,892	7,590	4,347	54.6
Northern district	II. p. 210, { p. 124	7,866,139	9,190	21,206	9,688	45.6
South England and South Wales	II. p. 381	5,390,965	5,080	6,162	4,061	65.2
London (Metropolis)	III. p. 18	3,810,744	10,711	23,234	13,325	57.3
London (City)	{ I. p. 2, { p. xxi. }	74,897	828	17,479	5,543	31.7
Cork	V.	78,382	182	118	109	92.3
Birkenhead	III. p. 135	80,567	111	304	132	36.2
Belfast	V.	174,394	577	76	64	84.2
Newcastle-upon-Tyne	III. p. 176	128,160	222	710	203	30.0
Dublin (Metropolitan Police)	IV. p. 2	311,983	1,125	3,735	1,517	40.6
Ireland (Royal Irish Constabulary)	V.	5,026,923	11,095	4,227	2,508	59.3

If the constabulary return were completed for the twelve months of 1880, I do not suppose the result would be so favourable to the force. This will be understood when we consider that the maximum of detection takes place when society is in a condition of perfect quiet. As social troubles become pronounced the percentage of detection must decrease until disturbance becomes rebellion, when police work ceases, and gives place to military operations. Whether the social troubles in Ireland will modify or become intensified is not within the argument of this paper; but it is not to be denied that within the past twelve months appreciable progress has been made towards the latter position.

It will be seen that the proportion of police to population in Ireland is considerably greater than in England except in the metropolis; but the necessity for sending two men in Ireland on every duty, except in Belfast, practically reduces the proportion, as far as supervision goes, to something below that in England. When we remember the unfavourable circumstances under which they act, their success can only be accounted for by their superior training and intelligence. While it is necessary that in Ireland the constabulary force should be homogeneous, there is room for improvement in its internal arrangements. There is as much difference between the police needs of one county and another in the north and south of Ireland as between the police necessities of Kerry and Norfolk. The ruling tradition of the constabulary is centralisation. All reports are drawn to the inspector-general's office, where instead of being annually collated and published for reference, as in England, they lie forgotten in the receptacles for old papers. The county inspector in Ireland occupies the same position as an English chief constable.

He is supposed to closely supervise everything going on in his county. He is responsible to some extent for the cleanliness of the men, and for their efficiency. But power he has none, as almost all reports against the men must be sent on to the inspector-general. With a force of 400 or 500 men in small detached parties there is, one way or another, a considerable amount of complaints about discipline. If a man is over an hour late for roll-call, the county inspector cannot deal with the complaint, but must forward it to head-quarters. If he is reported for drunkenness it must go up. If he is reported for smoking in his bedroom, or not making his bed, or not cutting his hair, or the most trivial offence that one man can be charged with by another, and denies it, the county inspector must send it forward that a court of inquiry, consisting of two officers, may be directed to assemble by warrant transmitted from the inspector-general to the county inspector, who would examine solemnly upon oath the witnesses *pro* and *con*, and decide the guilt or innocence of the accused. All this reduces the county inspector to the position of a transmitting clerk. He has practically no power to grant a favour to officer or man, and nearly as little to make them fear his displeasure. The time that might be profitably spent in giving the benefit of experienced supervision in his county is devoted to forwarding reams of paper to assist in the congestion of the inspector-general's office, and he is deprived of the responsibility necessary to bring out a strong man's powers. The inspector-general and his assistants suffer equally from emulating the elephant's trunk. The two permanent officials in Ireland whose responsibilities are greatest are the under-secretary and the inspector-general of constabulary. With the inspector-general's intimate knowledge of the country his matured opinion is of great importance; but no man can do more than one thing well at a time, and the ordinary routine business, with which the office is flooded under the system established long before the present inspector-general came into office, is more than enough to engross every moment of the time of any man who does it thoroughly. The present system is as if a general, in command of 11,000 men in the face of a vigilant enemy, were ordered to do all the regimental work of the battalions and elaborate his tactics in the intervals of escape from the fiddle-faddle of the orderly room. There are smaller points of detail in which the working of the constabulary might perhaps be improved, that I could not touch upon in the space of this paper. I have, therefore, confined myself to giving a glimpse of history that may help to explain the attitude of the people, and showing a few of the difficulties of a force now hastily condemned by the confident ignorance of some English papers.

HENRY A. BLAKE.

THE
NINETEENTH
CENTURY.

No. XLIX.—MARCH 1881.

EIGHTY YEARS.

IN 1861 Mr. Goldwin Smith wrote as follows :—‘ It may readily be granted that unless the union was for the good of both parties it was for the good of neither.’ Has it been for the good of Ireland or indirectly for the good of England ?

One hundred years ago Ireland entered the only epoch of her modern history to which she can look back with pride—the days when she was guided to independence and prosperity by Grattan and the volunteers. 1779 had been, like 1879, a year of great depression, owing to the interruption of Irish trade by the British Government, in order to prevent supplies reaching America from Ireland. At this time Ireland, though nominally independent, was in point of fact governed by England. The present organised insurrection in Ireland is daily reproached as being in its spirit purely mercenary ; but it should not be forgotten that the prime mover in the uprising of Ireland in 1780 was also a great commercial depression. The coasts of Ireland were then threatened by American and French privateers. England, being unable to protect the country, permitted the enrolment of the ‘volunteers.’ The movement began in Belfast in 1779, and before the end of April in the following year Grattan passed his famous resolution in the Irish House of Commons—‘ That no power on earth save the King, Lords, and Commons of Ireland had the right to make laws for Ireland.’ England, hampered with difficulties, and

face to face with a well-armed nation, conceded this, and bound herself for ever to these conditions.

Ireland was free and the nation rejoiced, though as yet the nation was not free, for the Penal Laws still existed. The Parliament too, though having shown itself capable of great things, was still hampered by elements of weakness and corruption. The English Government represented by the Castle and its officials watched every opportunity to undo the work of the volunteers. A parliament composed exclusively of a dominant caste and religion, placemen, representatives of rotten boroughs, and so-called independent members who were often broken-down gentry, was no efficient guard against the systematic encroachments of a wealthy, unscrupulous, and powerful government—a government too not wholly foreign, but subject to the one object of loyalty at that time—the Crown. It is remarkable how strongly loyalty was insisted on by the volunteers. Loyalty is a word almost forgotten now, and yet it might so easily have survived, had not the Crown systematically neglected Ireland.

All Europe was convulsed in the end of the century by the French revolution, and Ireland did not escape. By 1798 the National Party in parliament had fallen asunder, and to some extent the rule of the country lay again in the hands of the Lord-Lieutenant, with however this serious difference from the state of things previous to Grattan's declaration, that the Parliament and, behind the Parliament, the people were legally independent. Self-reform had been rejected by the Irish Parliament, and though Grattan and his party struggled for Catholic Emancipation, prejudice and the power of caste were too strong for him. The natural result followed in the rising of the 'United Irishmen,' which was soon crushed both in the north and south by the executive. In Wexford the unprepared people were goaded into a rising by means described by General Cockburn, a servant of the Government, as follows:—'Though the people in many places were driven to retaliation, it was not before murder, burning, destruction of property, and flogging, drove them to desperation.' However this may be, the Catholic atrocities of Wexford were followed by the Orange atrocities, pitch caps (a cap full of hot pitch allowed to harden on the head, then wrenched off, hair and scalp, the eyes too often destroyed by the pitch), and abominations without number. Little more than a month ago two men died who were then more than lads. The particulars of these horrors have been happily forgotten, but the almost more dangerous undefined sense of cruelties in the past lingers, nor is it likely to be uprooted by the spread of education.

In 1799, Ireland then stood in this position. A Roman Catholic people admitted at last to the franchise, but not capable of election; admitted to the bar, but not capable of its higher offices; excluded from the magistracy, and in point of fact from all responsible

positions; almost uneducated, and, as far as law could do it, without money, standing, or responsibility in their native country. Above them stood a race of squireens, well-to-do gentry and nobles, Protestants and often Orangemen—the Orange Society having been founded in 1775. These Protestants, being the owners of the soil, counted their political power (and their money price—each member's vote was estimated worth 2,000*l.*) by the heads of their tenants, the forty shilling freeholders (holders of leases valued at forty shillings over the reserved rent). Parliament was composed of placemen, holders of rotten boroughs, and of those gentlemen who were able to drive the largest show of tenants to the poll. It is surprising that even so large a number of independent men as were found in the last Irish Parliament managed to exist under such circumstances in the face of the enormous corruption used to pass the Union. Pitt stuck at nothing; 1,260,000*l.* is supposed to have been the price paid in cash, and promises, bribes, places, and honours fell to the share of every man who would accept them. Lord Cornwallis, the then Lord-Lieutenant, wrote to his friend General Ross on the 8th of June 1799: 'I despise and hate myself every hour for engaging in such dirty work.' The confusion caused by the civil war of 1798 was aggravated by permitting the cruelties of the Orangemen, and the Catholics were offered emancipation as the price of Union. It was passed in 1800 by a majority of 43 in the Commons, of 49 in the Lords, against the expressed wish of an immense majority of the people, led by the men who had made the fame of Ireland.

Civil war, a corrupt parliament, a people struggling to free themselves from penal law, a tremendous residuum of misery left by these laws among the agricultural population—could prosperity coexist with such a state of things? Let us see the testimony of the time. 1799. Foster, Speaker of the Irish House of Commons, says: 'We carry on at present a considerable cotton manufacture, increasing every day in every part of the kingdom.' Lord Sheffield says: 'Ireland has made an extraordinary progress in glass manufactures; again, 'Perhaps the improvement of Ireland is as rapid as any country ever experienced.' Earl Grey: 'There was nothing in the advancement of England to parallel the progress of Ireland.' The Guild of Merchants, Dublin, resolved, 'That the commerce of Ireland has increased and her manufactures improved beyond example since the independence of this kingdom was restored.' January 13, 1800. Roman Catholic meeting, Royal Exchange: 'That we are of opinion that the improvement of Ireland for the last twenty years is to be ascribed wholly to the independency of our legislature.' Lord Plunket described Ireland in 1798 'as a little island with a population of 4,000,000 or 5,000,000 people, hardy, gallant, and enthusiastic; possessed of all the means of civilisation; agriculture and commerce well pursued and understood; laws well arranged and administered;

a constitution fully recognised and established; her revenues, her trade, her manufactures, beyond the hope or example of any other country of her extent.' But these were advocates of independence to be taken 'with a grain of salt.' What said FitzGibbon, Lord Clare, the moving spirit of the Union? 'There is not a nation on the face of the habitable globe which had advanced in cultivation, in agriculture, in manufacture, with the same rapidity in the same period as Ireland.' England, too, was jealous of the progress of Ireland, as various resolutions showed. In 1785 the English manufacturers complained 'that Ireland would in progress of time beat them in their own markets.'

The English manufacturers had no reason to fear. The Union was passed, and the reign of famine began again. From the Union to 1847, Insurrection Acts and committees to inquire into the state of the poor were the staple produce of parliamentary government for Ireland. It will be necessary to look somewhat closely at the history of the chronic famine, the memory of which has been washed out by the flood of horrors of 1845, 1846, 1847. In 1821 the manufactures of Ireland were dying or dead; in the numbers employed in every trade a terrible falling off is seen; the unemployed tradesmen were crowded in misery in the cities of England and Ireland. As early as 1815 complaints were made before the Mendicity Committee in London that 20,000*l.* went in relief to the starving Irish in St. Giles. In Dublin the tradesmen are described as huddled together in corners of the rooms, trying to keep in life by mutual heat. In the country, for political purposes, the people were being manufactured into forty-shilling freeholders, who increased on the potato. In 1821 this crop failed. Other crops were abundant in the country, but the people were unable to buy the dearer food. 300,000*l.* and 14,000 tons of seed potatoes were voted by Parliament in addition to private charity amounting to 334,589*l.* Parliamentary committees and other sources show the people to have been dying by inches yet increasing in number. Nations increase recklessly when absolutely hopeless. Distress in a well-to-do population checks increase, but let a people once despair, and they will take no thought for the morrow—for the children that are to be born, or for the old age that is to be left destitute.

The 'terrific' famine, as it was called till 1847, came in 1821. In 1830 a committee of inquiry reports 'that the number of destitute poor in Ireland is exceedingly great, and that numbers of them perish gradually of inanition, or are carried off by chronic or inflammatory matter produced by wet, cold, and hunger.' Dr. Doyle describes more individually the process of perishing by inanition. 'The peasant lies down on a little straw upon the floor, and, remaining there motionless nearly all day, gets up in the evening, eats a few potatoes, then throws himself again upon the earth.' He says death is better

than such a life. What causes were given by this English commission for such a state of things—a state of things of which I could multiply evidence if needed? Absenteeism, tithes, high rents, low wages, and want of employment. Also, in 1829, the forty-shilling franchise ceased, and the committee add ‘that the number of the unemployed, as well as of the destitute poor, has been exceedingly increased, and their sufferings proportionally aggravated by the system of ejecting the smaller tenantry from their holdings and consolidating farms.’ The people, who had been allowed to increase for a political purpose, being now of no further use, were swept away by the landlords like flies off a window-pane.

After this time Sir C. G. Duffy speaks of a ‘famine every other year’ to 1845. The description is so true, that when the great famine came in the almost total destruction of the potato crop, Government refused to believe that things were much worse than usual, till three commissions had reported the destruction of the food of the people. The papers talked of the ‘famine mirage’ when the nation had been shown to be without food four months earlier. It is almost amusing in its grinness of ignorance to find Sir Robert Peel, the premier, writing to the Lord-Lieutenant to ask, in November 1845, ‘if any stock of old potatoes (of 1844) remained in the country’ (to avert famine), the Lord-Lieutenant gravely answering that no such stock existed. They appear to have thought potatoes, like oats or hay, capable of indefinite storage. The corn laws were repealed as the first help to meet the famine; the measure merely lowered the prices of Irish produce. The Indian meal was introduced; oats and corn went away to pay rent, &c.; the meal was an unpalatable food for a continuance, the Irish neither knew how to prepare it, nor, having it prepared, could eat it. The unvaried diet produced scurvy and bowel complaints, but even this food was denied to them unless at such prices ‘as would not interfere with local trade.’ Naturally local trade, where it existed (as a rule it did not exist in the worst parts), rose to famine prices, and the Government stores followed suit; but even in many cases the Government stores were not permitted to sell, lest they should interfere with the rise of a (previously non-existent) local trade, so that men actually died at the doors of the depôts with money in their hands. It would be a heartless task to bring up again the story of those three years. I am thankful to say that though then a child I cannot recall that time, but when I read and when I remember that some of the men now heading our present insurrection lived and suffered through it all, I can understand how it is they said to the people, when last year treading on the verge of another great famine, ‘You shall not starve—the first right of man is existence.’ I can recognise the central thought of the Land League song:

They died that ye might eat and live, God! they have died in vain.

My first conscious recognition of public interests was seeing women snatch food from the hands of their children, and hearing remarks on the 'demoralisation' of the people by the famine. Mr. Parnell, too, was born into the famine. These are impressions not to be wiped out with a sponge.

Since 1841 Ireland has lost 3,000,000 people, some through the most ghastly experiences of famine, some through an emigration that at first was almost an emigrating to death. And for those who lived how bitter and how terrible was this going forth into a strange land, among a people that knew them not! 'Weep ye not for the dead, neither bemoan him, but weep sore for him that goeth away: for he shall return no more, nor see his native country.' The misery of the moment was indeed to bear fruit. A seed was then cast into the ground, the least of all nations, a little people, was then cast out; now it is making wide the borders of its tabernacle, the desolate hath many more children than she which hath a husband—but the end is not yet come.

Ireland is now more thinly peopled than almost any country in Europe, yet if the year 1880 had been another bad year, we should at this moment have thousands in need of public charity. As it is, we have a social insurrection. What are its causes?

In 1742 an Act was passed enabling Catholics to hold leases with these conditions, and some relief for a few years from taxes that would naturally fall on landholders. The land leased 'must be *unprofitable* bog, which bog should not be deemed unprofitable unless it were at least four feet from the surface to the bottom of it when reclaimed, and that such bog should be, at least, one mile from any city or market-place.'

This permission to hold leases of apparently valueless land had been previously rejected by Parliament, as tending to encourage Popery. On this Act, which was largely taken advantage of, was doubtless founded in part the claim the people have all along fought for—the interest of the cultivators in the land. Large portions of profitable land were, at that time and after, absolutely *made* by the people themselves; and ever since the same process of redeeming what any other less miserable population would deem worthless has been going on.

That the agricultural population of Ireland was even at the time of the Union as miserable as it well could be is doubtless true, but it should be remembered that the population of Ireland was then only about what it is now, and that the rise of trade would have tended to correct the evils left by the hideous penal laws and misgovernment preceding the declaration of independence. The Irish Parliament took in 1793 the first important political step towards emancipation, by giving the franchise to the Catholics. This should have brought good, but it in fact brought evil, for it caused

the creation of the forty-shilling freeholders. In this we may distinctly see that the Union worked harmfully; for in a country where the great mass of the people were Catholics, and where the most distinguished Protestants desired equally with the Catholics a complete equality of rights, what would have been the natural effect of the franchise? Surely almost immediate emancipation. Emancipation was a thing so close before the eyes of the people, that Pitt in passing the Union distinctly promised it as part of the Union policy. What really happened? Year after year for twenty-four years Grattan wasted his splendid eloquence on the English House of Commons; year after year the most liberal and thoughtful of Englishmen supported their appeals; yet one year with another the Catholics seemed no nearer to their rights, and in fact they themselves seem to have sunk into a state of acquiescence and despair. But a leader appeared. O'Connell founded the Catholic Association in 1823. As now in the land question, as in the future will probably happen with the self-government question, Ireland lay apparently dead and stagnant like a dammed-up river. The touch was given, the tide swept all before it; in 1829 those very forty-shilling freeholders who, if the government had been, as in England, sensitive to public opinion, would have, long before this time, gained their liberty, now gained it indeed, but at the cost, one may say, of their very lives. When they were obedient tools in their landlords' hands the franchise was left to them; when they acted as freemen they were thrust back again into slavery. The bill introducing Catholic Emancipation disfranchised the forty-shilling freeholders.

Previous to this time the social war between landlord and tenant had been more or less acute, but henceforward it became a greater source of danger than before. But the tithe question came to the front first. Tithes paid by a people of one religion to the officers of another religion were a manifest injustice; but it needs not to say that the doing of justice was then considered the counsel of infidels, the loosening of the bonds of religion, and that reform was hooted at from under the cloak of bigotry. The people, however, took the law into their own hands in a way only to be paralleled by our present position, and doubtless the 'leader of priests and savages,' O'Connell, was then made responsible for all outrages, as Mr. Parnell is at the present moment. 'Boycotting' then was as common as now; all goods distrained for tithe were branded, none would buy them. The most ghastly forms of outrage, to which our most exaggerated tales of outrage bear no proportion, were common. A tremendously strong Coercion Bill was found useless; after a struggle of two years the Government had to compromise. The landlords took on themselves the payment of the adjusted tithes, they readjusted the rents, and so the tenant actually paid the tithe, though in a less obnoxious form. It is surprising that the people having fought so long should have been

satisfied with such a juggle, but O'Connell's influence was on the side of the settlement, and perhaps the immediate effects were more of a relief than the ultimate outcome; for the social evils of the loss of the franchise, and also of the rise of rents to replace tithes, cannot, I think, have been at once apparent, because the main body of the tenantry were leaseholders for life. The landlords probably, therefore, could not at once either evict extensively or raise rents; though even in 1830, at the commencement of the Tithe War, the ejectments were given as a cause of 'the exceeding increase of destitution.'

Foreign observers were able at this time to put their hands on the land laws of Ireland as the fountain of evil, and even Irish landlords and agents in Ulster acknowledged tenant right to be the secret of the prosperity of their province. Had Ireland been even at this time governed by her own parliament, a large number of members being Catholic and of the people, is it conceivable that a state of things due in the main to law, and described by foreigners as 'indescribable,' would have been able to go on through insurrection, coercion, famine, emigration, the loss of three millions of people, Fenianism, and to the threat of famine again, to land us after eighty years in the most formidable rising of the century? The landlords, had Ireland stood alone, would have been compelled to grant security for the outlay, labour, and homes of the people, or they would have been cast out to the void, as happened in France, as impediments to the national life.

In 1837 De Beaumont said: 'Irish misery forms a type by itself; . . . one recognises that no theoretical limits can be assigned to the misfortunes of nations.' In 1847 Mr. W. E. Forster said: 'Famine is there no new cry.' In 1880 Mr. Tuke said: 'Of the destitution and misery found in these bog dwellings I feel, after a lapse of twenty-four hours, I can hardly bring myself to write. It is not merely the unusual distress of to-day.' Colonel Dease reports to the Duchess of Marlborough's Fund, of the islands on the west coast, 15th of August, 1880: 'It is not too much to say that at least one-fourth of the houses are unfit for human habitation.' Mr. W. J. Fox reports to the Mansion House Committee, 3rd of July, 1880, of Mayo: 'Everywhere the condition of the children was dreadful.' I pass over 1846, when the starved dogs lived on the flesh of the dead, and one surveyor collected 140 bodies on the roads. That is a story one dare not unveil. In the autumn of 1880, Colonel Gordon, writing at the time of a good harvest, said he had seen nothing like the state of the west of Ireland in any part of the world. (I cannot quote his letter.) Now it would be unfair to say that Ireland all round is as wretched as fifty years ago. She is not; but misery dwells undisturbed in large districts, and her prosperity is very uncertain, as shown last year. Hitherto the people in one district have not known what was going on in another,

and it appears to me that the fact in our present insurrection, that the well-to-do parts are fighting for the weak parts, the northern Protestants more or less openly with the southern Catholics, is a promise of that internal union which has seemed hitherto unattainable. The press has to be thanked for this, which has brought to light stories (true or false) of the oppression of the poor in out-of-the-way parts. I have seen the results from day to day. I have seen the awakening of sympathy with unknown sufferers. I know that farmers who last year thought of nothing but their own family, now at least say, 'It is shameful the labourers should be housed like dogs.' When Mr. Parnell said to the men of Tipperary, 'You are well off, you are comfortable, but you must organise, for the men of Mayo are in danger,' he said what would make us a nation.

That the Act of 1870 failed to go to the root of the evil is admitted now that the Land League rules Ireland. Was it admitted before? Was the Land League necessary? If England had but opened her ears to hear, it need not have been; but every effort, and the efforts were numberless, of the Irish members to attract attention to its failure, was in the ears of the English members 'as much to the purpose as dogs baying to the moon.'¹ Every Bill introduced was simply extinguished. The Irish members spoke to houses composed of Irish members, but at the divisions the strength of party was used without hesitation against them. This is the history of one debate, which shows constitutional action *versus* agitation.

On February 6, 1878, Mr. McCarthy Downing introduced for the second reading Mr. Butt's bill on Land Tenure Reform. In an interesting speech, he set about to show that the Act of 1870 had failed, inasmuch as it left to the landlord the power of exacting excessive rents by capricious eviction. He showed that for the three years before 1870, the notices to quit were 4,253; the three years after, 5,641; that the return for the two years from October 1875 to October 1877 showed 8,439 notices to quit, which meant that over 40,000 persons were in danger. The returns for six years of notices to relieving officers to provide shelter, gave an average of 10,651 persons yearly threatened with eviction. These figures might, we may suppose, have secured attention, but to them there are certain stereotyped answers. 1. That on many estates a yearly notice to quit was the estate rule, not necessarily meaning anything. Granted, but does not the answer show a worse face than the figures it attempts to lessen? Tenancy at will from year to year is bad enough, but tenancy with such a sword of Damocles capable of being brought to bear without further notice is far worse. 2. That where evictions did take place, the tenants were often put back as caretakers. There is as much difference between a caretaker and a tenant as between a man in a ship and a man on a plank of his former ship on the open

¹ Professor Rogers, January 3, 1881. Reading Liberal Association.

seas. 3. That sales were pushed on by creditors, and the landlords not responsible. However that may be, I think we may grant the subject was worthy of inquiry, when affecting so seriously the great interest of the nation. Mr. McCarthy Downing then called attention to the trial for libel of a man named Casey, who had accused Mr. Buckley of harsh and unjust dealings. Two murders had, I think, happened on the estate. Mr. Casey was acquitted after the management of the estate had been inquired into by Judge Barry and Judge Fitzgerald. Judge Barry described how in January 1874 a demand was made on the tenants for a rise in rent, to be paid from the 25th of March then next. He explained that this demand was illegal, because 'the tenants were by law entitled to hold at the old rent to the end of the year.' He observes: 'I shall not comment on the pregnant use of the word "submit" in this document, but every tenant who did not submit, so far as I can gather, was served with a notice to quit.' Again, still quoting from Judge Barry: 'The increase of rent forced after this fashion upon these tenants ranged from fifty to 500 per cent. on the old rents, and this is in many instances absolutely true. The average increase on the whole of them is more than 100 per cent.'

Now who or what were the people thus called upon to pay more than 100 per cent. increase of rent, and that nine months before it was legally due? Were they wealthy merchants, independent farmers, or skilled artisans able to turn elsewhere for a living? No; they were probably the descendants of those poor Catholics who had been permitted to reclaim 'unprofitable bog.' They lived 1,500 feet above the sea, on the wild slopes of the Galtees. The Galtees are within distant sight of my home. Many and many a day, when all was green and warm and sunny about me, I have looked towards those mountains, and have seen them beautiful in their radiant coating of hail, or frost, or snow. Beautiful in the distance, but hard and cold for the poor dwellers on tiny farms amid bog, and heather, and boulder. 'A Land Valuer'² in a very interesting pamphlet quotes evidence showing how such land is reclaimed. (It should be understood that the plains are limestone, the hills sandstone.)

Q. Will you tell me how you reclaimed that land?

A. To go to the limestone quarry that was on the low land, and to fill my lord a little donkey car; to fill about six cwt., to drive on until we began to get against the steep hill; to unload a portion until we got into another cliff; to unload a portion again, and in the long run you would not know what colour was the horse, only white, like the day he was foaled, with sweat; and, upon my oath, there would not be more than one cwt. when it reached the kiln.

This little bit out of most interesting evidence may show what farming on the slopes of the Galtees is like. It hardly needs show-

² *Fixity of Tenure at Fair Rents impracticable as a Final Settlement.* By a Land Valuer. M. H. Gill, Dublin.

ing that toilers like these were not able to take the law against a very rich man. If they had done so, and had gained their cause, still they would have been evicted. They might have had a little money in their pockets, but that liable to law expenses, other claims, and quite inadequate to the support of their families. Justice Fitzgerald, speaking on the same case, said: 'Let us take any one of the occupiers on this town land. To him his farm is everything. He has probably lived and worked on it all his life, is skilled in no other labour, has no other means of existence; and if deprived of it may become a wanderer without a home, until ultimately he finds one in the workhouse.'

This was not the only case brought forward by Mr. McCarthy Downing. In another which also came before the courts, the agent was proved to have served notices of which this is a sample. The tenant held at 16*l.* 16*s.* 'Unless you to-morrow at nine o'clock execute a lease of your farm at 30*l.* a year, I shall increase my terms to 40*l.* a year, and my attorney's full charges of three guineas a lease.' Mr. McCarthy Downing hoped 'the House would agree with him that he had given the extremest cases of oppression and disregard of all equity and justice,' and surely one might have expected the House to listen, and examine a demand for reform so backed up. No. 'The time of the House could not be taken up week after week by Irish Land Acts.' The Irish had got the Act of 1870, they should be satisfied. The bill was thrown out by a majority of 200. I can speak for myself. I took this case at the time as a test case. 'Is it possible to get justice done in London to the weak and oppressed in Ireland?' I asked myself. Thousands doubtless felt the same, for it was commented on in every paper. In the face of the fact that Irish members tried over and over again to call the attention of Parliament to a state of things which was producing outrage, which might—in fact did—produce insurrection, that they were simply thrust on one side, I asked myself could this go on if the Parliament which governed Ireland were really sensitive to Irish opinion? Cavour, an upholder of the Union, says: 'Without force Ireland will never obtain anything from England, but her force against England consists in agitation.' True enough, but that he should have used the word insurrection instead of agitation. We who experience insurrection feel it a heavy price to pay for legislation. In thirty-five years this is the third insurrection and far the most dangerous. I feel almost certain that if self-government is not granted peaceably another twenty years will show us a fourth, if indeed it is not at our very doors, and if we do not get it I think it is a question whether we should not be better simply ruled by the sword, without the farce of elections, &c. As we are at present we cannot govern ourselves, and England refuses to attend when reforms are needed, then throws the blame on us for her neglect. A single responsible despotic governor

might perhaps do better, but I fear he too would be hampered by the ignorance of his fellow-countrymen. Give us Lord Dufferin. Let him settle this land question as he likes, he appears to me to see further into it than any one whose ideas I have yet seen. Give him absolute power and do not interfere with him. I dare say we should do very well; but at least let us get rid of this Union which is no Union, this government by Parliament which is not responsible to our public opinion.

That the legislation of Ireland has hitherto been only won at the point of the sword is easy to show. Since the Union our most memorable Acts have been Catholic Emancipation, Commutation of Tithes, Disestablishment of the Church, the Land Act of 1870, and our present legislation on land tenure. In five-and-twenty years parliamentary action failed to advance the first in an appreciable degree; five or six years of the Catholic Association, and it was won all along the line. Thirty years failed to do away with tithes; two years of the tithe war, the question was settled. O'Connell by the influence he had gained over the people affected the legislation for Ireland during the remainder of his life. The famine forced attention on Irish affairs, and the Encumbered Estates Court and other minor legislation rose out of it. Then came a pause till the Fenian scare. It swept away the Church and forced on land reform. Obstruction may or may not have given us the Intermediate Education Bill; it is hard to say as yet how far it was a sop. Now we have the Land League, and are trying to make up for the neglect of 'the stitch in time which saves nine.'

It is folly to blink the fact that the Irish people have taken to heart O'Connell's maxim, 'Ireland never yet trusted but she was betrayed.' For myself I have the strongest confidence not only in the good intentions of Mr. Gladstone and of Mr. Forster, but of the great mass of the English public, but I look back into history and see that men who as regards their English career showed themselves worthy of trust, yet failed in Irish matters; not because of a want of will, but because they had to work against an impossibility, namely, the setting to rights of a state other than their own in which almost every part was radically wrong. It will be said, 'That may be true, but now the work is done.' That is the mistake England has always made. She has wanted to rest on her oars, and meanwhile the tide was bearing her whither she knew not. Our education is not settled; our franchise, our labour question, our migratory labour question, our poor law question, our waste land question, are not settled. The land question cannot be settled by a stroke of the pen. The waste lands, which were a 'question' fifty years ago, still remain waste; indeed, I believe have been added to of late years by land falling out of cultivation and gradually becoming unfit for cattle-feeding. These waste lands Lord John Russell pro-

posed to reclaim in the famine years. He spoke of the employment it would give, of the produce in food, &c. It was opposed; he dropped it without a struggle, and the people died. Lord George Bentinck tried heart and soul to get the money then wasted on useless labour employed on railways. He failed, and even now railways are wanted in those very districts where the present danger had its birth. Last session the people of Donegal tried to get a railway allowed in the House of Lords (it appears we pay on an average 2,000*l.* on every petty bill passing the House). Lord Redesdale threw it out because of its being a narrow gauge. The country is too poor to carry an expensive railway, but if Lord Redesdale had travelled through it he would have known a steam wheelbarrow would be better than its present roads.

These wild parts of Ireland, where the soil, even to an Irish person, seems hopelessly bad, and where the people live as Mr. Tuke described this spring, are a very fountain of danger to the whole country. Mayo, where the Land League had its birth, was also the birthplace of famine and fever. Fever was actually there, the famine was stayed. Lord Lifford is right in saying there was plenty of food in the country. There was, but the people had not money to buy it. The loss in potatoes, 10,000,000*l.* in three years, told all over Ireland, but especially among the 'mountainy' people in tiny farms. Mayo and the whole north-west suffered from a source special to themselves. Thence came the harvest labourers of England and Scotland, whose bits of land were more like the villa residences of business men than like actual farms. These 'idle Irish' habitually leave home from March on, toil through the whole spring and summer in England and Scotland, if work is to be had, remain even up to Christmas; then return to their families for a few weeks, bringing money to support wife and child and rent during the following year. I have seen the Donegal harvest men returning home, small, sturdy, ugly, rough-looking fellows in very poor clothing, but doubtless with money in their pockets. Why do these people not settle in the country where they work? The poor laws prevent them. If any Irishman fall sick or is brought to the workhouse, at least in the country parts, he is drafted home to his native place by the next ship. He must therefore cling to his home there, or he would find no home but the workhouse. But for this the major part of the population of Mayo would, doubtless, have settled in England and Scotland. I presume they have been too poor to emigrate largely to America. In 1878, 20,000 men went from Mayo alone, but of 1878 we hear that it was so bad a year in England that many had to borrow money to pay their way home. This was the beginning of the distress in Mayo, combined with a bad potato harvest. In 1879 it is to be supposed that the early goers sent back bad reports, for only 15,000 went that year, throwing 5,000 men on the labour market of a very limited

area at one stroke. Their loss in wages for that year is estimated to have been 100,000*l*. The potato crop at home had failed, and those who had gone to England came back empty-handed, with the partial loss of travelling expenses. 'A very bad year, the worst I ever recollect,' is the report for 1879 as regards English and Scotch wages. The old debts, money borrowed to go to England and to return, money borrowed to support the family, the wages of 1878 having largely failed—and the landlords—stared them in the face. From whence could the landlord's money come? Probably this came home as a life and death question to thousands, answered then most likely reverently, 'The Lord only knows,' or, 'It is in the will of God.' But the memory of the great famine was not dead. Claremorris and Swinford were then, as last year, words of ill omen. At Carraroe in Galway, at a large eviction, the women fought the police, and their blood on the bayonets gave life to the nascent Land League. This was under Mr. Lowther in 1879. Then the cry arose 'We will not lie down and die, as our fathers lay down and died thirty years ago.' This was where and how the Land League arose, though it was in existence some months earlier under Mr. Davitt's care.

The sudden and very heavy losses in 1879 had terrified the whole of Ireland. The farmers felt, as I think is doubtless the case, that if years like 1879 were to come frequently, they would be utterly ruined. Inflated by the good years preceding 1877, they had run heavily into debt, bid wild prices for the good-will of farms, and agreed often to rack rents, where they had independence to make their own bargains, and where they had not, the landlords had raised the rents at their pleasure. The cry of rescue came from the far-away country, of the circumstances of which they knew little or nothing. It found an echo in every man's heart. Their way was shown by leaders of great ability; they learnt to combine and to be fearless. Then came the natural temptations of all combinations. 'He that is not with us is against us.' The movement must be universal, or it would fail man by man. Supplies to the enemy's camp must be stopped on the instant. No consideration for good, fair, and popular landlords could be allowed to stand in the way of the success of a class war. At this time an earnest and upright man, whom the people could, and I believe at heart *do*, respect, came instead of the flouting and jeering Mr. Lowther. A premier who appealed to Parliament with all his wonderful eloquence to save the home right of the people, came in place of a premier who, when the cry of famine was in the land, mocked a people threatened with death.³ I

³ November 11, 1879. After the deputation of seventy members of Parliament, and another from the Roman Catholic bishops and archbishops, had declared the country in danger of famine, Lord Beaconsfield at the Lord Mayor's banquet spoke as follows about the distress in England and Ireland, and that the English distress was not accompanied by agitation. 'My Lord, I wish that our brilliant brethren in

thought this change might stay the current; it failed to do so. Mr. Forster and Mr. Gladstone used all their new-won strength to build a small rampart between the people and their landlords. They failed, but they did not fail in convincing the people they were in the right. 'Boycotting,' and outrage, and a state of terror which has multiplied the true outrages tenfold, have brought the whole executive to a standstill. We are compelled to take stock of our position. England has a problem of immeasurable difficulty before her. How can she deal with these 35,000 poor Cónnaught labourers who must be years in arrears of rent? If she forcibly expatriates them, she raises for herself enemies in foreign lands; she thrusts out her humble unknown servants, who have been patiently tilling her lands and reaping her fields; who, indeed, have been flung aside before now, for if one of them fails through toil or sickness, he is returned at once to be a burden on his own poor home, which already bears the care and education of his wife and his children. Two men may be working side by side in one field, an Englishman and an Irishman: an accident disables both. The Englishman is carried to his own home, outdoor relief is given to him, his wife and children stand about his bed, he returns to his labour when able. The Irishman is taken to the work-house; his native place is inquired. 'Mayo.' 'Oh, then he is none of ours.' Sent home as soon as possible, he must go to the work-house, no outdoor relief (I think rightly) being given in Ireland. When he recovers he is hundreds of miles from his work, his season is lost, and likely enough more than one season. But the cries of them that have reaped have entered into the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth. From these poor neglected harvest men has arisen a danger to the empire not yet sounded.

In that we landlords knew in some degree of evils going on, and did not to the full cry out against them, we deserve what will come. But how little power we had, even the best of us! Those most sensible of the wrong-doing perpetrated by members of their class could still do nothing to save themselves. The cleverest, most liberal, most upright man, can do nothing for his country as things stand. Unless prepared to fly at the throat of England, he is no fit tool for the people. He must stand on one side and wait, till England's neglect and Ireland's misery crush him to the ground. His intellect,

Ireland would be a little more emulous of this example. They perhaps can hardly be expected to follow such a regular and logical course of reasoning as this, and they are not so much favoured; but I confess I am utterly at a loss to comprehend how the Irish people have brought themselves to believe that the best remedies for economical distress are political agitation and social confusion. . . . But I would venture to hope that the Irish people, convinced upon reflection that the sympathy of England is a sentiment which has never been scantily applied to them, will *even* *condescend* to recollect that, though they have had a bad harvest, their harvest is much better than the harvest of England; and though I am aware that the harvest of Ireland is a matter of greater importance than the harvest of England, still that is a circumstance which should not be omitted from their memory.'

his education, are worthless to him and his country. They show him the dangers of Home Rule, but they show him also the blundering of England. He chafes, as any man would chafe, at being bound hand and foot to a foreign government which he sees incompetent, at being represented by men whom he dislikes. I think the instinct of the people is in the right, that only as an independent nation can Ireland make use of her great powers. 'The most illiterate and uninformed creatures upon earth are judges of a practical oppression,'⁴ and I believe such an oppression is holding down Ireland, and will hold her down, while her people's voice is not directly heard, save through agitation and outrage. You English have undertaken what one of your own greatest statesmen described thus:—'The whole scheme of union went on that false and abominable presumption that we could legislate better for the Irish than they could for themselves, a principle founded upon the most arrogant despotism and tyranny.'⁵

In 1780 we were at least a nation. Our leaders were gentlemen, and the Catholic people were ready followers. In 1880 we are shattered in pieces, our gentlemen are crying for defence against their own countrymen, an army of 25,000 men is needed to hold the country down, we have stepped from famine into insurrection, our only trade is in great danger, our parliamentary representation is given only to those who will be as wolves at the heels of England. We had gained through an extreme of misery 3,000,000 people, we have lost them again through unspeakable suffering. But this is not all. We have gone forth as the Jews through every city and through every people. We are counted by millions in your midst.⁶ Our little island, our little fountain of tears and blood, has sent forth a stream now a mighty river. We are in the hands of the Lord. We will not try like David to number our people. If they be fifteen or twenty millions, or more, that is only for to-day. We are no race born to die. I do not fear for my race, but I do fear for our little island. I fear more for England. England has all to lose, we have nothing. Which is strongest then? It is not yet too late to give us back our country, to live hand in hand in freedom. By the history of eighty years, I ask the young and Radical opinion of England, was not Charles James Fox right when he said 'we ought not to presume to legislate for a nation in whose feelings and affections, wants and interests, opinions and prejudices, we have no sympathy?'

Is 'Home Rule' then possible? No. I think not in its ordinary meaning. I cannot see how a parliament, composed of men who, like bulldogs, have been tossed and gored by England, yet who have driven her half-mad, could work harmoniously with England. I do not see how a House of Lords of 'old Whigs,' Tories, and Orangemen

⁴ Burke.

⁵ C. J. Fox.

⁶ One in seven of the population of the towns of Scotland, one in thirteen in the towns in England.

could work with them or with the country. Above all, I don't believe the Castle and its authorities, dependent on English faction, could ever be other than rightly unpopular. No. I should step out of this train which has wrecked us—I should clear the lines, and fetch up a new engine. I should note the fact that three times in late years Irishmen have attempted self-government, always on the same lines, always with success in the internal working. The Protestant Church has a constitution consisting of manhood suffrage, parochial nominators, diocesan nominators, diocesan synod, general synod, hierarchy. The Fenians had universal suffrage (practically manhood), local centres, local head centres, Dublin head centre, executive strong, and from outside, not originally elective. The Land League has universal suffrage, local leagues, county leagues, head league, and strong executive, not originally elected. Cannot we stop, and see the way the mind of the people is working? The Irish, to be well governed, must be absolutely free, because they are in daily communication with America; because the country swarms with clever ready-witted men, who talk politics and *think* them too from morning to night; because they are half-educated already, and will never be content with less than freedom. The Irish, to be well governed, must be governed by a strong executive, because they are *only* half-educated, because they are rash, excitable, prone to try to right their wrongs by illegal methods, and because they are clever and need a balance. The Irish, to be well governed, must have their nationality respected. They read with shame and indignation their history, but they do not wish to cease to be Irishmen. They know that every race in the west of Europe has contributed to make of them one people, but they are now all Irish. Ireland is their country, Ireland their home, their hope, their pride, their sorrow, their interest. Irishmen they are, and must remain. We want freedom, a strong executive, nationality. Except for the memory of Grattan, the people thoroughly distrust and dislike parliamentary government. I would do away with it. I would go on the lines the people have themselves marked out. I would give universal suffrage to elect local members for limited districts who would form provincial assemblies, numbering in members say one hundred for each province. (Munster understands no more of the life of Connaught than England does.) They should elect a council, say twenty-five from each province, to meet in Dublin. I would have all local affairs managed by the province, all public affairs managed by the council. I would have at the head of the executive an Irishman appointed by the Crown, permanent and unconnected with English party. Two such men might be at once pointed out—Sir C. G. Duffy and Lord Dufferin. I would give the whole power of the executive and army into his hands. I would have no official responsible to the English Parliament. The Governor-General should only be removed by vote of both Houses of

Parliament in England, or by vote of two-thirds of three local parliaments, one-third of the fourth, and majority of the council in Ireland. I would govern the people by elected magistrates and crown resident magistrates, elected grand juries and crown judges; a police governed by the local assemblies, an army governed by the crown. I believe if an Irishman, such as Lord Dufferin, whom the nation is proud of, was given at one stroke the management of the country into his hands, along with individual freedom, Ireland might do very well yet, if not interfered with by England. Lord Dufferin disbelieves in the three F's as a final settlement, so do the people, as far as one can judge, though in the difficulty of an immediate change they would be accepted as a stopgap. Lord Dufferin considers peasant proprietorship to be just in the abstract, so do the people. Surely some solution might be come at even in this supremely difficult question if the nation felt itself responsible. At present it is going its own wild way. It is responsible neither to the present nor to the future. It knows well only a small paring of its demands will be granted, but it can worry England and frighten the landlords. Make the nation responsible, and you place a bridge over the morass; make the nation free, and you draw the teeth of sedition; give every man the opportunity of expressing his thought legally, you bring the brains of the nation to the side of peace.

CHARLOTTE G. O'BRIEN.

RADICALISM: A FAMILIAR COLLOQUY.

MRS. HERVEY was a lady of some importance in London, and of great importance at Cannes. At this latter place she was possessed of the largest villa, and the one best arranged for receiving in; and her gardens, further, were so exceptional in their beauty that though countless notices proclaimed them to be strictly private, there were few genuine tourists who did not make a point of visiting them. Mrs. Hervey had two lawn-tennis courts, the delight of the young and active; and some unique brown sherry, the delight of the wise of every age. She had personal charms, moreover, which almost equalled her adventitious ones; it was therefore only in the nature of things that all her parties were excellent, and composed exclusively of the pick of Cannes society. Nor was social selection always the only thing she embodied in them. Herself the daughter of a staunch Conservative peer, and the wife of a Conservative ex-minister, her smaller gatherings had a delicate party flavour; and though fashionable Radicals even might recruit their popular energies on her tennis-courts, they were kept like weeds out of her luncheon and her dinner-lists. These contained none but such as were on the right side in politics, with the exception of a few distinguished Whigs, who appeared there like rare exotics.

To-day there was wanting even this alien element. As pure a Conservative clique as ever broke bread together had just risen from an early lunch or breakfast, and had settled in easy chairs under the shade of the broad verandah. The glow, though, and the glare of the sun was warming everything; the air of January was soft as the air of June; fountains splashed hard by amongst tall and slender eucalyptus trees, and through spiked palm-leaves showed the blue depths of the sky. Cigarettes, coffee, and liqueurs were being handed round; and when, under this new dispensation of comfort, conversation again developed itself, our friends began deploring the shattered state of their party, and the imminent ruin of their own country in consequence. Their views, as is usual upon such occasions, were gloomy in an extreme degree. One brighter remark only, like a solitary star, had twinkled through the clouds for a moment, and was again lost in them. This proceeded from a newly-created peer, who had received his

honours from the dying hands of the late Government, and who was heard in one period of the conversation assuring Mrs. Hervey that England, through all its changes, was still beneath the surface thoroughly aristocratic in its sentiments.

‘My dear lady,’ he said, ‘you may talk as you will, but it’s a feeling that goes through all classes. Your own butler has as much of it as you or I. He makes each one of those powdered fellows call him *sir*; and they, too, when they come to be butlers, will exact just the same deference from their own subordinates.’

‘So they do now,’ replied Mrs. Hervey, ‘for matter of that. I overheard John, one day, abusing the hall-boy; and I can tell you,’ she said laughing, ‘that he swore like any lord at him.’

‘Exactly,’ said my lord approvingly; ‘it’s exactly what I say. And it always will be so—at least in England—always will be so.’

‘That is,’ said Mrs. Hervey, ‘if Mr. Gladstone leaves us any footmen or any hall-boys at all.’

‘Ah,’ replied his lordship, relapsing again into pessimism, ‘the situation is certainly very serious.’ And with that the bright gleam faded. The grounds for Conservative confidence disappeared from the conversation; and Conservative forebodings again became uppermost.

‘My goodness! when will they stop?’ exclaimed a young man in a very impatient undertone. He was speaking to a handsome girl next him, who seemed to lose no pretext for raising her eyes to his. ‘Croak, croak, croak,’ he said. ‘There they go; it’s the true Conservative chorus. If this doesn’t stop soon, I shall have to get up and go.’

‘No, don’t go,’ said his fair companion winningly. ‘Why should this fidget you? You are not a Radical, are you?’

‘If I were it would delight me, not fidget me. It is because they are my friends that I can’t bear to hear them exposing themselves. All these gloomy predictions really mean nothing. They neither warn any one, instruct any one, nor frighten any one. They are simply an annoying form of small-talk. I beg your pardon, though; I must eat my own words again. They do warn, they do instruct, and they do frighten me; not, however, because they throw much light on the troubles that are to come in the future, but because they throw much light on the weakness of our own party in the present. This querulous despondency of Conservative conversation shows how little our average Conservatives understand the strength of their cause; and it may really tend for a certain time to reduce it. Idiots! since their last defeat they have done little but complain how complete it was. It has been, for all the world, as though they were crying, “Come, kick me.” And, on my word, were I a Radical, I should like to go and do it.’

‘Well,’ said the young lady, ‘there is no use shirking facts. Last year we were beaten, and beaten terribly. Five of our family were in the last Parliament, and only two in this.’

‘That may well be; but that does not alter what I was saying. Every cause at times suffers repulses, and it is for its own good that it does so. But no cause deserves to win that cannot endure defeat. Now our noble friend over there made one very sane remark just now, but the strange thing was that he dropped it as soon as made.’

‘And what remark was that?—that the Conservative cause had a sure future before it, because Mrs. Hervey’s footman was heard to swear at the hall-boy?’

‘Precisely; and I shall remind him again of it, when he has done whispering about me to Mrs. Hervey; for that’s what he is doing now—I know it is by the look of him.’

Nor was this conjecture wrong. ‘Who’s that young man?’ his lordship was just then asking. ‘You told me his name at luncheon, but I couldn’t quite distinguish it.’

‘Oh,’ said Mrs. Hervey, ‘that is young Mr. Seacorts, who contested South——shire at the last election, and who was only beaten by six votes. I think you must have heard of him.’

‘Heard of him! God bless my soul, of course I have! How are you, my dear fellow—how are you? I’m a trifle deaf, and I didn’t catch your name just now. Why, your father and I were at school together, at college together, and in the House of Commons together. I wonder what he’d have thought of the present state of affairs, eh? You ought to be in the House of Commons too, if the people had only known their duty.’

‘Oh,’ laughed Seacorts, ‘I can afford to wait.’

‘H’m,’ sighed the other, ‘these are bad times for waiting. The real fact is you’re a great deal too gentlemanly for the electors. They don’t want a gentleman now if they can help it.’

‘I should be sorry to think that myself; and I am surprised that you should think it. You said, but a few moments ago, that the country was still, under the surface, thoroughly aristocratic in sentiment.’

‘Ah,’ said his lordship, not without some surprise, ‘I was thinking of social matters then, not of politics. So far as politics go, I believe the masses to be profoundly Radical; and where it will all end, Heaven only knows. Isn’t that your opinion? Hasn’t your experience told you that?’

‘No,’ said Seacorts, ‘I can really not say that it has. The masses themselves I do not believe to be Radical.’

‘Then where,’ interposed Mrs. Hervey, ‘would you say the Radical power came from?’

‘I should say that it acted through the masses, but that it does not originate in the masses. Its origin is higher in the social scale. It springs from a certain section of the middle class, and it is really a middle-class cause, and not a popular one.’

‘This is just,’ said Mrs. Hervey, ‘what you spoke to me about

yesterday; and there was a conversation you had had with some Radical acquaintance of yours, which you promised to repeat to me. But you know *my* opinion is, that the middle classes are exceedingly *un-Radical*. They may be safe steady-going Liberals, if you like; but there is nothing in their creed that is in the least Radical or alarming.'

'Radicalism,' said Seacorts, 'is not a creed; it is simply a piece of temper.'

'There,' said Mrs. Hervey, 'again we differ. I should have thought the middle classes the most phlegmatic part of the community.'

'The middle classes,' said Seacorts, 'are a miscellaneous body; and certain sections are doubtless as you describe them. But the section that I allude to is at once small and peculiar. I shall describe it by a somewhat vague, and yet very suggestive term, as the *disaffected* section. The disaffection I ascribe to it is a highly complex thing; a variety of causes go to the production of it: and it is only when we study the causes, that we can really understand the effect. What I mean is, in other words, this: if we would understand Radicalism, we should study the biography of Radicals; and I mean now by Radicals, not the rank and file of the party, but the leaders more or less prominent, who, either in public or in private, have zeal to spread their opinions.'

'I thought,' replied Mrs. Hervey, 'that you said they had no opinions—nothing but a piece of temper.'

'Yes; but a piece of temper, when it gets beyond ejaculations, always expresses itself in the form of certain opinions. Indeed, developed ill-temper *is* a set of opinions; that is the analysis of it; and these often seem to have an extreme coherency, and are assented to by the persons holding them with a vigour and fierceness of faith which it is hard elsewhere to parallel. But their special peculiarity lies in the ground they are held upon; and this is simply the imagination in a certain excited state. It was De Quincey, I think, who observed that of all forms of imagination, the imagination of ill-temper is the strongest. It is stronger than the poet's; it is stronger even than the lover's, except in those frequent cases where the two are identical. You know, Mrs. Hervey—at least, I hope you don't know—how bitterly two lovers, when they quarrel, will accuse each other; how they will draw up in an instant hateful, wanton indictments, tissues each of them of circumstantial falsehoods; and how these falsehoods for the moment will seem to have all the venom of truth in them, and will curse equally both those who give and take them. Well, social ill-temper is the same sort of thing as the lover's, except that it lasts longer, and is more easy to communicate.'

'Give us an instance,' said his lordship gravely. 'I confess that at this moment I don't quite follow you.'

‘I can give you an extremely simple one. An engaged couple go together to a ball. The man meets a fair friend of former days, and, with a purely brotherly feeling, says a few friendly words to her. The *fiancée* thinks he is flirting, takes sudden offence, and for the rest of the evening sits out on the back-stairs with a guardsman. The entertainment comes to an end, and the happy couple drive home together. What do they say to each other? The man is sullen; the lady begins the battle. “Well,” she exclaims, “and a pretty way you behaved to-night. But it’s always the same. I quite knew what to expect. You can never see a single pretty girl—always provided that you are not engaged to marry her—but you sit in her pocket the whole evening long. And you always choose the person that you know I should most object to. It’s not that you care for her, or admire her, or think her the least bit pretty; but that you long and desire to slight and irritate me.” There’s the lover’s temper. The Radical’s is just the same; only what excites the Radical is a condition of society in which he must always have superiors; and it is with these superiors that his imagination busies itself. Rank, birth, breeding, and any riches that are in excess of his own, are distorted by his imagination into hateful or absurd abuses; and he attacks them as such with the diseased ingenuity of a lifetime.’

Mrs. Hervey was a true woman, even in the way in which her thoughts would wander. ‘I’ve been wondering, Mr. Seacorts,’ she said, ‘all this time, what is the exact class of people you are speaking about. Are they people one would meet, do you mean? or what?’

‘I don’t know whether *you* personally would meet them, Mrs. Hervey. I should think very likely not; but I can’t define the class very accurately, because it is, as it were, a kind of secret society, and the points of agreement between its members are often far below the surface. One thing, however, we may say, I think, quite safely. Radicals, as a rule, are people without land, and have but slight social connection with the landed interest.’

‘I wish,’ said his lordship, ‘I could believe that were so. But there were actually sixty peers who voted for Mr. Gladstone’s Disturbance Bill.’

‘But they did that,’ said Seacorts, ‘as Liberals, not as Radicals; and though I think that as Liberals they acted on this occasion wrongly, yet a true Liberal is, at least in will and intention, as anti-Radical as any true Conservative. If you want to know what a real Radical is—I had last week a long discussion with one; and I promised Mrs. Hervey to give her some account of it. Indeed, if I hadn’t found such a party assembled here, I meant to have told her about it this morning.’

‘Tell us now,’ said Mrs. Hervey; ‘we should all like to hear, and I’m longing to know what you think a real Radical is.’

‘Of course,’ said Seacorts, ‘a Radical is a vague word, and many

people may apply it to themselves who would reject the meaning that I put upon it. But I use it as I do, because my meaning, I think, corresponds to the *feelings*, if not to the thoughts, that in general conversation are bound up with it. But you shall judge of this for yourselves, if you really wish for my story. The Radical hero is a gentleman named Sprigsby. He is the son of a small solicitor who lives in the town near us, and his mother was the daughter of one of my father's farmers. The boy was extremely sharp, he did wonders at his grammar-school, and then did wonders at Oxford; and when I myself went to Christ Church, I found him a full-blown don. But he was more than a mere don—he was a don with vehement views on political and social matters. His chief bugbear in politics was the House of Lords; his chief social bugbears were what he considered *swells*, generally; and the chief things he insisted on were the rights of knowledge and intellect. At that time knowledge in his case meant chiefly a knowledge of the Peloponnesian war. He had all the details of it at his fingers' ends, and, strong in the consciousness of this fact, he gave a lecture at Birmingham on the English system of land tenure. Soon after he went to London, where he wrote for various papers; and he is now secretary to the Society for the Abolition of Feudalism.'

'What is he like?' said Mrs. Hervey. 'Does he dress well? is he at all like a gentleman?'

'He is,' said Seacorts, 'not at all a bad fellow in some ways; but his manner and look are, I must say, a little against him. At Oxford his get-up was shocking. He had inky nails, and a grey flannel shirt. But since he's taken to London, he is rather spruce than otherwise, and has become the sort of man who wears a tall hat in the country. His real misfortune, however, is his manner. It's the rarest thing with him to be properly at his ease. He seems always afraid that you will not think enough of him; and for fear you should be supercilious to him, he is never civil to you. Well, such is the man with whom I had that discourse which Mrs. Hervey wants now to be told about. It happened in this way. I left Cannes last week that I might spend a few days at San Remo, where, who should I meet, the morning after my arrival, but my friend Mr. Sprigsby, in the hotel garden. I think, I must say, he was really pleased at seeing me, as he knew no language but his own, and had no English acquaintances. His greeting, therefore, was as nearly cordial as I had ever known it to be; and having seen, by the way he had begun to step out, that he was bent on a walk, I proposed to go with him, and we set off together.

"You were surprised, no doubt," he began presently, "at finding me here. These idle places are not much in my line, it is true; but the fact is, I have fairly overworked myself, and I have been positively obliged to come away for a month or two. And yet even here I am not quite idle; I still find something to be busy with."

‘I observed, as he said this, that he had several printed papers with him, and asked him what they were. He did not at the time give any direct answer, but he proposed that by-and-by we should find a seat somewhere, and then he said he could show me. Meanwhile he at once plunged into politics, and with a peculiarly grating *brusquerie* he reminded me of the last election. “The day of the lords and squires,” he said, “is gone by, even in the counties. I am sorry for you personally; but you have been born fifty years too late, and in this generation you are like a fish out of water. However, there’s no use regretting it; the whole thing’s gone, and it can never be called back again.”

‘He said all this in a high, half-mincing voice, accompanied now and then with a little nervous laugh of condescension. The man did not mean to be rude, but his *animus* on the subject was too strong for him, and he could not help himself. This put me on my mettle, and I answered him rather sharply. “The day of the lords and squires,” I said, “is by no means so far spent as you think: and suppose it were, would the days of navvies be much improvement on it?”

‘My friend said nothing to this. He only looked straight before him through his spectacles, and lengthened his thin lips into a set, continued smile. I was thoroughly provoked by him. I could see he detected this; and I could see too that it pleased him, for he still preserved the same grimacing silence, and his face for a good five minutes was a discourse in dumb show on his own superior wisdom. At length he began, with the air of a college lecturer. “The history of this century is a history of the popular triumph. It is that, and nothing but that. One after one we have taken the strongholds of privilege; and those that are yet untaken are about to fall presently. Even now they are tottering. We have got at last to the citadel; the people are at last at the land laws; and by this time twelvemonth we shall have made pretty work of them, I can assure you. Do you,” he said, with another little laugh, “think of again contesting the county?” I said, “Certainly.” “I should advise you not,” he answered. “If you do it will be a painful thing for you. The country was bad enough for you, I fancy, last election; but by the next you will find it far worse. By that time you will have to face the enfranchised labourers, and I should hardly advise you to try that.” “Did you never,” I said, “hear of a reaction? Popular feeling, whenever it is set moving, always for a time sways to and fro, like a pendulum.” Again Mr. Sprigsby gave a little high petulant chuckle. “You might as soon,” he said, “expect that brook there to flow uphill as expect the resolution of the people now to either falter or reverse itself. Till the people knew their strength, as long as they did but vaguely suspect it, they might vacillate, and there might be, perhaps, reaction. But that’s all changed now. They are the masters, and they mean to use their mastery.” “I can’t see myself,”

I said, "that there is much change in the situation." "Can't you?" he answered. "Well, then, the change is this. Education and intellect have now reached the people; and education and intellect know nothing of rank or privilege. The only rank and the only privilege known by them is that of the clearest head and the most comprehensive vision; and it is under these henceforward that the people will array themselves." "And pray who," I said, "is to settle whose vision is the most comprehensive?" "The common sense of the multitude when alive to its own interests. A great art critic was once asked the requirements for painting a great picture, and his answer was this—'Know what you want to do, and do it.' It is precisely the same advice that the Radical gives the people; and what the Radical leader does is to teach them what they want. In Hamlet's words, he holds the mirror up to them. What they have but felt confusedly he professes to utter plainly; and though they themselves could not have expressed the truth, they can instantly recognise it, let it once be expressed for them. That is the reason why we have now the ear of the country. That is the reason why we can address the people with confidence. Now with what cry, I ask you, could you again go to the country? What could you promise the constituents whose interests you would profess to advocate? Nothing, absolutely nothing. You couldn't say to them, *There is my house, and there is my fine park. See how much of the land I occupy; I eat up in a year what would keep fifty of you in comfort. As this has gone on for a given number of centuries, you must have the affection for it that comes out of old acquaintance, and therefore, as men and Englishmen, elect me for the conservation of it.*" "No," I said drily. "I admit I could not say that; and yet that is just a Radical's notion of what an honest Conservative would say." "See," said Sprigsby, "let us go along that footpath. There is a place I have discovered there where we can sit down pleasantly; and there I will show you a few of these papers I have with me."

'I was charmed for a moment to have some respite from politics; and for the first time in our walk we began to enjoy the scenery. Our way when we had left the town had been up a zigzag road that scaled a gigantic hillside, and by-and-by led away amongst the mountains. On either side of us had been orange and lemon groves, under whose shades the grass was as green nearly as in England. The whole declivity was traversed with water-courses, and our ear caught continually the sound of falling waters. The path we now entered lay through a lovely orange orchard, slanting so steeply that the deep azure of the Mediterranean was the complete background of nearly half the trees. Across it went a grey mediæval aqueduct, which, though it looked picturesquely ruinous, still later took a rill of water to a moss-grown mill below us. We followed the course of the aqueduct till we came to the fountain it was fed by. This gushed

out from the hillside as clear as crystal, and two gnarled olive trees made a green shade over its cradle. There was a bank at hand that was at once warm and dry, and on that we settled ourselves. "Look," I said, "at one time this spring was no doubt held sacred. Those broken stones by the olive trees must have once been a saint's shrine." "Probably," said my friend; "and if you look a little to the left you will see a wooden crucifix." And with that, to my surprise, he broke out into a piece of poetry.

The suns have branded black, the rains
Striped gray that piteous God of theirs.
The face is full of prayers and pains
To which they bring their pains and prayers.¹

'One of the most softening elements in Sprigsby's character was a genuine, though suppressed, taste for poetry and for scenery; and both of them, I was happy to see, were having a soothing effect upon him. "See," he said, as he unfolded his packet of papers, "these are the things that I said I'd show you. You'll find several things there, I fancy, that are well worth your attention."

'I took the papers, and found they were various tracts or pamphlets issued by the Society for the Abolition of Feudalism. "That is the way," he said, "in which our party appeal to the people." One of these productions was an invective against the game laws; another against deer forests; another against yachting, and another against primogeniture. Then there was one with the rather whimsical title of *Touching your Hat—why not to do it*; and another headed, *On the use of the word 'Sir'; or, Independence versus Servility*. And here I came to something of a rather different character. It was a speech of a Russian Nihilist, made at Brussels, before a Congress of Social Democrats. "Good gracious!" I exclaimed, "and so you have Russian Nihilism here, have you, as well as English Radicalism?" "We print," he said very quickly, "the chief utterances of all the Democratic Societies on the Continent. That was done upon my recommendation; though I am not myself responsible either for the selection or the translation. What you have there I have not yet read myself; but I have had a number of letters, which tell me that it is exceptionally fine. We print these things, you see, not because we acquiesce in the details of the Continental programme, but because we are entirely at one with the real spirit and aims of it. Oppressions in some countries are more crying than even in ours; and they therefore excuse, if they do not justify, somewhat stronger protests. But our differences are only on the surface. The Radical party, all the world over, is at heart a united brotherhood." "Well," I answered, "let us see what your Nihilist says for himself." And I began to read aloud. I can't remember the whole

¹ *Songs before Sunrise.*

of it, but the sound was certainly terrible. It was full partly of scientific and partly of scriptural phrases—the latter naturally turned to a new significance. The way it ended was this:—*Much is done, but much remains to be done. Yes, much remains, and yet how little! The mine is prepared, the powder is stored. It only rests for us to apply the match to it. It is but the work of a moment; but in that tumultuous moment shall be compressed the events of eras. Dynasties shall have crumbled—princes, nobles, plutocrats, priests, and armies, all shall have disappeared. The two great curses that have blighted man's existence shall have gone for ever—religion and civilisation. Yes, do not start. Do not be awed by words. Religion and civilisation, we shall destroy both of them. We shall destroy this temple, and in less than three days we shall have raised another. In a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, all the world will be changed! and then shall have arisen, self-created, a new heaven and a new earth. The hour is coming; let us not fear to welcome it. The chariot of Revolution is rolling, and gnashing its teeth as it rolls.*²

‘The effect of this passage on my friend was not a little amusing. I took a furtive look at him every now and then as I was reading it, and his face was like that of a man who is taking some nasty medicine, and is for trying to hide his extreme distaste at the flavour. At last, when I came to that truly wonderful climax, he caught the paper from my hand, and declared I was inventing. When he found I was not, he was a little subdued in manner, and he began to talk to me as though I were almost his equal in intelligence. “Of course,” he said, “all that tall talk is foolish, in so far as it is tall talk. But we must judge it in the light of its special occasions, and the special men it was addressed to. I have heard apologists of Catholic fetishism try to disarm our ridicule of the spangled and crinolined madonnas by saying that such tawdry finery represented to the peasant worshippers all that was really splendid. And the defence, I think, is quite sound in its way, though it is a defence of the peasantry and not of the superstition that enslaves them. Now we may say just the same thing of this hasty oratory of the Democrats. It may be wretched to the eye of criticism, and may yet speak a profound truth to the men it was intended for. I certainly myself should not have allowed that speech to be printed by our society had I myself seen it. But that is not because I disallow the real meaning that is embodied by it, but because to the English reader the style would do that meaning injustice. What we want to bring home to the minds of the English people is that their cause is a universal cause. Nothing will increase, as that will, their self-respect, their dignity, and their determination. The social relation-

² This last sentence is transcribed from the report of an actual speech made by a German Socialist during the course of the past year.

ship of England, with regard to the Continental countries, we conceive briefly to be this. From them we shall catch fire and enthusiasm; from us they will catch moderation and sound sense." "And what," I said, "is your view with regard to Ireland? What lesson is that to teach you?" "The same lesson," he said, "that we learn from Germany, France, and Russia. We learn from it courage and determination. We learn from it that the people have only to combine, and in little more than an instant they will secure their freedom. We learn from Ireland lessons beyond value. We learn the weakness of privilege and the strength of freedom. Ireland is at this moment doing this great deed for us—it is laying bare the rock on which the society of the future is to be founded. Don't think, however, that we are apologising for murder or mutilation, or any form of terrorism. We condemn them as strongly as the most bigoted or the most timid of Tories. We consider them atrocious and guilty, even more distinctly than they do. We only impute the guilt to the really guilty parties; and these are the victims, they are not the perpetrators. To provoke murder is more wicked than to murder; to tempt is more devilish than to fall. However," he went on, as though conscious he had committed himself, "I can hardly expect you to admit that. You too are an Englishman, and you must judge of the Radical cause by the form it assumes in England, and the demands it makes there. Turn from that speech that you have just been reading, and you will see a little pamphlet of my own. You will find there no fine phrases and no vague prophecies. You will find there perfectly sober, simple, and rational demands; and principles that, when once stated, even you will not contradict." He took the pamphlet himself, and began to read to me. His title was, I think, *An Address to the Idle Classes*. There was nothing very new in the matter of it, but I can still remember one or two of the sentences:—*Does wealth make a man wiser than his fellows, or does birth make him better? Does the constant pursuit of frivolous pleasure, does the constant pampering of his own appetite, does the jealousy preserved inaptitude for any useful occupation—does all this, I say, fit a man to govern? Does a class of men deserve to be regarded as our superiors, when their only distinctive mark is an ostentatious inferiority? Two idols hitherto have overawed the people—Wealth and Birth. Their power has been great; but it was founded only on superstition, and the superstition it was founded on is already dissolving. My lords and gentlemen, it is well that you should be aware of this fact. You can, indeed, hardly yourselves be blind to it. The demeanour of the people towards you is no longer what it once was. You can see it in their tones and gestures; and you will do well if you are warned in time by it. You have lived long enough in your present un-*

natural condition. The health of the body politic will suffer you to do so no longer. You have driven men from their homes to make way for your deer; you have let the crops be ruined that your game might grow fat upon them; you have diverted the skill that should be building vessels for commerce, so that it should build yachts for your own idleness. It is time that you should come to your senses, and that these follies should cease. The sooner you come to your senses the better will it be for yourselves. The demands of the people are firm, but they are not uncourteous, nor will they be unless you force them yourselves to become so. The condemnation passed is at present only upon your environment. It will be on your own heads should it have ever to fall upon yourselves. "No doubt," said Sprigsby, "you think all that very violent. I suppose in society" (here he gave a titter) "it would be called extremely vulgar. But I put it to your own candour, is it not true, every word of it? Is there one sentence in it that is not on the side of justice and reason? Is there one sentence in it that the popular common sense will not at once say Amen to? Or, to put the matter in a strictly practical way, will you ever, on the Conservative side, be able to make such a moving speech as that? I spoke of the matter, of course," he added, "not the style."

'And do you mean,' said the newly-created peer, 'that an Oxford don would speak to you like this? I hope to goodness you didn't reply to the fellow.'

'On the contrary,' said Seacorts, 'I replied with great interest; and my reply was this: "As for your general maxims, Mr. Sprigsby, I cannot dispose of them off-hand. I may say, however, that I could engage, on the Conservative side, to appeal to the people even more forcibly than you can do. Like you, of course, I refer not to style, but to matter." Sprigsby looked quite aghast at me for a moment; but then suddenly his look softened, and he began to speak in a more genial way than I had yet known him to do. "Hum," he said, "you are not naturally a selfish man. Tell me now, would you, for the sake of a few fancied advantages, which can never be extended beyond a very limited circle—would you wish, even suppose you could do so, to blight the lives for generations of the greater part of your race? Have the pride of birth and the deceitfulness of riches hardened so utterly the hearts of you and yours? And yet I fear that it is so. The power of selfishness is greater than the power of faith. It can keep fixed the mountains of prejudice when every other force is at work to remove them." These last words roused me. "You are wrong," I said. "You and your whole school deceive yourselves. You look upon life and its miseries, and then from the real world you turn to an ideal one. There every wrong that here offends you is righted. Everything is bright, and free, and happy; and as you contemplate this fancied future, the more indignant and

sorrowful do you become over this present. Such you consider to be your special insight—the monopoly of your school. How little do you know either of human nature or history! Such visions as these are not peculiar to revolutionaries. They visit all of us; they visit the heart of man. They make no distinction between the Tory and the Radical. A week ago I was on a famous spot. I was on a hillside, as we are here, that went down to the Mediterranean. I was seated on a marble seat, beneath the shade of immense ilex trees. The leaves of two of them made an oval frame before me, and this living frame was filled by a diminutive world-famed bay. On either horn of it was an Italian fishing village, crowned with the towers of a mouldering feudal fortress; and the sea between these flashed, and glowed, and sparkled, and beyond, paler and paler, stretched out to the high horizon. I felt, as I sat there, full of a strange excitement; and the cause was this. I had just climbed up thither from the beach below, and I had been looking on the beach at a small dilapidated villa that stood close to the water's edge, and against whose walls the shingle was always chafing. Why should this have moved me? I will tell you. I had been talking for some time to an old boatman—a bronzed and decrepit man, who was sitting quietly sunning himself. I asked him about the villa, and whom he remembered as having lived there. 'Once,' he told me—'that was when I was a young man—there was an English poet lived there; and all the people in the village used to call him The Angel. And then,' he added, and his voice sank lower, 'there was another English poet who at times would come to visit him, and *his* aspect was quite different.' Do you understand me now? The place was Lerici, and the villa I had been looking at was Shelley's; the spot under the ilexes, where I was sitting, had been Shelley's favourite haunt. I am not a hero-worshipper—I am not an enthusiast, but still I had come to Shelley's abode as a pilgrim; and the incidents of the day had set every chord of my imagination vibrating. All nature about me was looking lovely and beautiful, and the hopes and the aims of life, and the possible future of mankind, seemed in a manner to be transfigured before me. Kingless continents, sinless as Eden, filled the visionary future—the homes of noble thoughts, and brotherly love, and freedom; and my memory began to echo with the songs and prophecies of the inspired poet of Communism. The language of your friend the Nihilist would at that moment have not seemed to me meaningless; but there was nobler language than his at that moment ready for me:—

Another Athens shall arise,
 And to remoter time
 Bequeath, like sunset to the skies,
 The splendour of its prime;
 And leave, if nought so bright can live,
 All earth can take, or Heaven can give.

Saturn and love their long repose
Shall burst, more bright and good
Than all who fell; than One who rose,
Than many unsubdued;
Not gold, not blood, their altar dowers,
But votive tears and symbol flowers.³

Do you think it is Radical eyes only that can see such visions, and be moved by them? These are peculiar to no parties. They affect the hearts of every one of you; and the imagination will at times present them to every reflecting man."

"Ah!" exclaimed Sprigsby, "you admit all this, do you? Well, now you can see why our society publishes such speeches as that one of the Nihilist. You have explained my own position even better than I could do myself. Understand the spirit of the movement, and even rant—or what seems like rant—will come to have a meaning in it. But," he continued, "since you admit all this, can you resolve, consistently with either reason or common sense, to come forward again on the side of stagnation and selfishness, or try to cajole the people with acquiescing in their own degradation? Will your conscience let you try to do so? or will your common sense let you hope that you will succeed?" "Yes," I said, "my conscience and my common sense will let me do both these things. Let me trespass on your patience for a few moments longer, and I shall very soon explain myself. All these visions of some transfigured future for man—they are beautiful, they are alluring; they move and appeal to us in any degree you like; but they are altogether impracticable. We not only cannot ever realise them perfectly. In their newer distinctive features we cannot even approach them. I will give you an instance. Liberty and equality—in all the Radical visions the two ideas are prominent. Well, in an ideal world the two look well enough together; but in the real world they can never be united. The two are irreconcilable." "Irreconcilable!" exclaimed Sprigsby; "why, the whole course of modern history has been the history of their gradual union!" "So your school think," I said; "and there are certain reasons, though I can hardly with propriety mention them to you, which will probably make it think so for some time longer. However, though I have no hope of convincing you, I can at least show you the grounds on which I shall hope to convince others, if it shall ever again be my lot to appeal to a constituency. In the first place, then, you will let me observe shortly, that there is no necessary connection whatever between a thing being vividly picturable and its being in the least degree practicable. We can picture to ourselves angels with wings, or floating in the air without them; and we can wish we had wings ourselves, and we can dream of flying about and soaring. But we know that as a matter of course men will never float nor fly. I maintain, then, in the first place, that the Radical Utopia would be

³ Shelley, *Hellas*.

no whit more impracticable than it is at present, were one of its principal features the growth of wings on its citizens. But how shall I prove that? I cannot do so at length now, but I can show you the chief line of the argument. And I shall show you this by the aid of your Continental sympathizers. I admit as fully as you do that your cause is bound up with theirs. They have, however, gone a little further into the matter than you have in England; and they are a little more conscious of their own meaning and principles. They have not been content with looking at the social mirage from a distance. They have gone nearer to it—though not near enough to see that it is a mirage only—and they have seen certain of the laws and principles, and certain of the conditions of human nature that are of necessity implied by it. Here, then, are some of them. They are not of my own invention, but have been gathered from the language of the Continental Radicals themselves. For the production of the Radical Utopia—for the production of the only thing that gives Radicalism any meaning, three things amongst others are indispensable. Private property is to be abolished. Marriage is to be abolished. Physical labour is to be shared equally by all.”¹ “Oh yes,” exclaimed Sprigsby impatiently, “we have all heard that.” “If you have,” I said, “it seems you have not considered it. I have, and it seems to me well worth considering. These three points I have just mentioned—doubtless we have all heard of them; but let us consider them a little further. There is a good deal implied in them that does not lie on the surface. Private property is to be abolished. What is meant by that? No human being is to save anything. Every one is to be a state pensioner. That is the condition of the ideal human being of the future. What further? Physical labour is to be shared equally by all. That is expressed also in another and more suggestive way. There is to be a normal day of labour. This provision seems to mean that everyone shall be insured a due proportion of leisure. It is really a protection against thought, skill, and industry. It is a menace to the industrious, not a promise to the weary. But that is not all. Its design is not only to crush individual industry, but to extinguish individual genius. Let a man be fit for the higher work, he is to be shackled, like the dullest dolt, to the lowest. Hours that might have produced a Hamlet, are to be occupied in cleaning sewers.” Sprigsby tried to interrupt me. “Pooh,” he said, “all this is nonsense. Nobody means this.” “It may be nonsense,” I said, “but for all that many

¹ The demand of modern socialism: 1. The abolition of money, inheritance, and private property; 2. Restriction of the isolated household, and development of the associated house; 3. Freedom of sexual intercourse; 4. Compulsory and equal sharing of all physical labour; 5. Economical arrangements for the prevention of waste; 6. Organisation of labour; 7. Equal division of the means of existence and enjoyment; 8. Universal diffusion of education, science, and arts.—*Social Architecture*, by an Exile from France. (Quoted by the Rev. M. Kaufmann.)

people mean it. Whether such people are really of power and importance is more than I can say. You, at any rate, think they are. You have said yourself that they belong to your party, and that their views are one with yours. Be patient with me a moment longer. Let me speak of one point more. Marriage, say the Continental Radicals, is to be abolished." "True," said Sprigsby, "but only as a sacrament and a superstition, not as a solemn contract. Why marriage, my good fellow," he said, "is the basis of all society." "And it is precisely because it is so," I said, "that your Continental friends declare it must be done away with. They see what it means well enough; they see what is implied in it; and they only strike at it that they may strike at something beyond it. What they want to strike at is the family and the home. The home, the hearth, with all the affections that cluster round it and flourish by it—there is the real centre of all Conservatism. There is the perfect pattern of private property; there is a perpetual protest against all forms of Communism. What then is Radicalism, or Socialism, or social Democracy, or Communism? It is ostensibly, and to the minds both of its apostles and its proselytes, a struggle towards an ideal that is, on the face of it, all-beautiful. But what it is really is something very different. To see its real character you must look long and hard at it; and as you look at it thus, you will see it begin to change. You have seen the well-known picture of the head of a dead Christ, with closed and heavy-lidded eyes, which is so painted that if you look in a certain way at it, the eyes of a sudden seem to you wide open. The face of Communism, if you look at it, is of something the same kind. It at first seems the face of an angel; stare at it long enough and you will find you are confronted by a fiend. The ideal that Communism aims at is an ideal that is essentially impracticable. Human nature will not ever admit of its being realised. How do we know this? The very Communists themselves bear witness to it. Though they do not perceive this, their own programme confesses it, and the more complete their programme grows the more complete becomes this confession. And what is the alarming result, that makes me compare Communism to a fiend? I will tell you. Conspiring to produce what human nature makes an impossibility, Communism is nothing more nor less than a conspiracy against human nature. The demands it makes itself unconsciously betray this. Every one of these in reality is a demand for coercion. Turn to what side of human nature it will, in every instinct, in every appetite, and in every affection it finds a secret, but an irreconcilable foe. Nature makes men unequal. To equalise them Communism has to war with nature. Its ideal government is a vast system of police, in whose eyes the chief crimes are exceptional talent, exceptional industry, any form of individuality, any personal attachments, or any craving for freedom. It has been well said that revolutions

devour their own children; and this is true not only of men but of principles. It is but yesterday that the Radical cry was for liberty. Poets ranted about it, philosophers reasoned about it. Blind mobs, and blinder leaders of mobs, shrieked, and squeaked, and shouted for it. And now—what now? They are asking not that liberty should be given men in a greater degree than it is already, but what they already have should be taken away from them. The motto of these madmen within two generations has reversed itself. It was at first, ‘Let us develop human nature;’ now it is, ‘Let us crush it.’ Popular movements proverbially are ignorant of their own meaning; but never in the world’s history has there been one to compare with this. Never has the irony of fate been so swift and so unmistakable. Never has any party, like our modern Radicals, been forced so utterly to renounce their own principles; and in the short space of a single twenty years to blaspheme at the end every important principle which they adored at the beginning as an axiom or a sacred dogma.”

‘Sprigsby had been listening to all this with a silence that surprised me—thanks, I at first thought, to his patience. Patience, however, had in fact very little to do with it; what kept him silent was simply the breathlessness of irritation. But at last he found his voice, though it began with being little more than a gasp. “You are talking nonsense,” he said. “You don’t know what you are speaking about. If Radicalism has renounced its principles it is no longer Radicalism; it is no longer the same party.” “Not so,” I said. “The continuity of Radicalism is beyond the reach of principles. Principles are its servants, not its master. Its master is a passion, that is its real *self*; this is the thing which is essential and continuous in it. It only invokes principles that it may gratify this passion.” “And what passion,” said Sprigsby, still gasping, “is that?” “It is the passion,” I said, “of envy, hatred, and malice. It is envy reduced to a system, and made the foundation of all politics. Envy is the one passion that the Socialist party appeals to as a really moving force; and though there are many fairer ambitions that it pays homage to, by the way, it is envy that it is secretly titillating all the time. And yet such is these men’s infatuation, such is their self-deception, that a polity which is formed in hate will be completed, they say, and made lasting by love.”

“Good gracious me! good gracious me!” exclaimed Sprigsby. “I hardly know where to begin; I hardly know how to answer you. You are so utterly wrong on all points. What do you mean? What are you talking about? Are you speaking to me? Has all this anything to do with *me*? Do you want to convince *me* of anything? If so, you are only tilting at windmills. I am an English Radical, not a Continental Socialist. Why, the two are as the poles asunder. They have nothing whatever to do with each other.” Here he suddenly recollected himself; he came to a dead stop for a moment, and a

slight blush overspread his face. "I mean," he went on, "we of course have aims in common. That is what I was just now saying to you. But all these extreme doctrines—they are nothing to us. These are the very points in which we correct our Continental allies, not the points in which we follow them. Nothing can do a sober cause like that of English Radicalism such a wrong as confusing it with Continental Communism." "If you mean by doing it *such a wrong*, striking such a practical blow at it, then I entirely agree with you; and it is precisely such a blow I am anxious to see struck." "Ah," cried my companion, "that is a fine Conservative utterance. You would try to discredit a party by maligning it to a credulous populace! But you, Seacorts, I have a better opinion of you personally. You do not seriously mean that you would resort to such an artifice yourself. Come now, and tell me this candidly. Do you in sober earnest suppose, do you even suspect that a man like me, for instance, would strike at such institutions as marriage, or domesticity, or the security of property, or any of those habits or institutions which all history, from its earliest dawn till now, has taught us are essential to society? Why many of our leading Radicals are men of large fortune, are merchants, or manufacturers, who continue, and presumably approve of, their occupations all the while they are conducting their campaign in politics. Surely the implicit sanction that these men give to property is a sufficient guarantee that their party is not at war with it. Then take again the question of equality. Equality is a word which, as we use it, you must not push into any extreme sense. It has a valuable practical meaning; but this is valuable practically because we do not overstrain it theoretically."

"Mr. Sprigsby," I said, "do not misunderstand me. You, and the more educated Radicals in England—any of you who in any way have the least chance or the least hope of leading—I attribute to none of you any of these Continental ideas. I believe them to be entirely repugnant to you. You told me, for instance, when I last saw you in London that you were paid four hundred a year for managing this society you are connected with. Agents of the Land League in Ireland draw even more than that as professional agitators. No; pray do not mistake me. No one in his heart hates equality more than does an English Radical; no one in general has a sharper eye to business."

"Stop," cried Sprigsby, in a voice shrill with excitement, "you are wrong again. We do not hate equality. We only demand that it shall be rational, comparative—based on the real facts of life. Our real demand is, not that there shall be no inequality, but that there shall be no artificial inequality." "Well," I replied, "I will for argument sake admit all that on this score you say of yourself. I do, as a fact, not only admit a great part of it, but my own view of the situation stands and falls with the truth of it." "And yet," says Sprigsby, "admitting all this, admitting the prudence, the sagacity, the

moderation of the English Radical, you declare that your own political tactics would be to traduce him to the English masses by associating him with the wildest and the most impracticable schemes which the friends of freedom on the Continent have done themselves so much harm by propounding!" "You admit," I said, "that those schemes are impracticable. Well, now, listen to me. Your party prides itself on having the support of the people. Your force is in the fancied adherence of the masses. You imagine they will always support you. And I admit that you have on the surface some grounds for this confidence. But in what way do you seek this support? You appeal, you will say, to the people's reason, to their sense of justice, to their sense of their own power, and so on, and you promise that if they will lend their force to you, you will do all kinds of fine things for them. But what you mean by your eloquence, and what the people think you mean by it, are quite distinct things; and your programme of action, though yourselves you do not know this, is to apply force for one purpose which has been committed to you for another."

"And pray what," said Sprigsby, "do the people think we mean, that is beyond or different from what we do mean?" "I was wrong," I answered, "when I used the word *think*. I should have used the word *feel*; for what you appeal to is not popular *thought* at all; it is popular *feeling*. Indeed, of thought, as a moving principle, there is next to nothing on either side. What moves your party are certain passions, and you, by it, stir up in the people like passions also. But one thing you quite forget. Words and sentiments which for you have one significance, have for the people another. You repudiate the teachings of Continental Communism; the people of England have never even thought them out for themselves. But you and the Communists are doing really the same work. You are appealing to exactly the same turbulent and anarchic passions that they have appealed to—passions which, as you yourselves admit, can never be satisfied, and whose demands can only be stated in the language of self-contradiction. You tell me you don't believe in absolute equality yourself; and, as I told you before, I can well believe that. But when you talk about equality to the people, when you preach to them the virtue of an independent spirit, what meaning do they attach to your language? One, I can tell you, that is very different from your own. What you mean is that you, and those who feel as you do, are equal to your superiors." "And pray whom," exclaimed Sprigsby, with what he took for a fine irony, "would you call my superiors?" "You are perpetually talking about them yourself," I said, "and I believe you call them the aristocracy." "The aristocracy are *not* our superiors," said Sprigsby, with a sudden accession of emphasis. "The superstitious reverence accorded to the hitherto governing classes has been the most blighting of all the influences that have ever touched our politics. It is a kind of

political popery, and it is the first thing that a free and cultivated Radicalism protests against." "It is," I said; "I most entirely agree with you. English Radicalism is really a protest against aristocracy; it is not a protest in favour of equality. But what I am telling you is that while in your own hearts you feel it to be the former, in your general language and in your professions to the people you proclaim it to be the latter. Here it is that your party is weak. It is not fighting under its true colours. It is not conscious of this hollowness. I do not lay this to its charge; but the deepest unrealities are often those of which we are least conscious; and some day, should the political strife ever grow keen enough, the mask it now wears will be stripped from it. Then it will be seen that this party, which is at present thought by some to utter the real voice of the people, is nothing but a class protest, in the narrowest sense of the word. And now, Mr. Sprigsby, I beg you will mark this; for we are here trenching on rather difficult ground, and I hinted just now that I doubted if I could venture on it at all with you. The class that makes this protest has doubtless many merits. It unites a large amount of culture and knowledge, and here and there its members are men of wealth. But however excellent this class may be, yet regarded as a class it is one that can never be popular. If the English people are to have superiors at all, they prefer aristocratic superiors; and once let their eyes be opened, the last thing they would consent to would be to play into the hands of a middle-class as such, and invest it with the very power which it had itself declared should belong to nobody. Let me tell you a little story of what happened to me at the Snow Hill Station at Birmingham. I had just seated myself in a first-class carriage, when an old gentleman entered, attended by a porter. I was struck by the pleasantness of his manner to the man, and by the respect and willing attention of the man to him. The porter had hardly quitted the carriage, when he was hailed by another passenger, who was also about to take a place in it. 'Here,' cried the new comer, roughly, 'go and fetch my bag and rugs out of the waiting-room, and put in a foot-warmer. Ah,' he cried with a smile, when he saw the old gentleman, 'good morning, my lord. Hi, porter, come back here, I tell you. Put in a foot-warmer for his lordship also. These Birmingham fellows never know their business.' The old gentleman answered with a somewhat stiff politeness that he had just declined a foot-warmer, as he had a special objection to one. The other, a little confused, walked across the platform to a bookstall, and when the porter returned, I asked 'who that gentleman was?' 'Gentleman, sir,' said the porter, with a curious twinkle in his eye, 'why that's Mr. Nix, one of these here Radical agents.' And looking again on my other fellow-traveller, I recognised in him a slight acquaintance of my own—one of the chief Conservative peers of the midland counties."

‘I had not meant,’ Seacorts went on, ‘to have told this story to Sprigsby. Considering his position it was not a fair thing to have done, and I began to feel hot the very moment afterwards, for I could see in an instant that I had made him very angry, or more hurt than angry—I was puzzled to tell which. He explained it himself in another moment, as he rose suddenly from the ground and took his stick, “Nix!” he said; “why Nix is my own brother-in-law.” Ah, me, for the perils that beset the unguarded speaker. I was thoroughly embarrassed for a moment, but a happy inspiration came to me, and I took the bull by the horns. “Well,” I said, “I’m sorry I spoke; but what I have told you is, all the same, the truth, and I’m sorry you’ve a brother-in-law with such a singularly unfortunate manner. If I hadn’t been talking to such a thorough gentleman as yourself, I should have been very much annoyed at such a slip of the tongue; but I know that you must see the thing I mean. Mr. Nix has too grand a way with him, and a natural air of command which is terribly out of keeping with an *ex officio* friend of the people.” I was driven to lie—I couldn’t help myself; but my lie worked upon Sprigsby like magic, and though he would not admit it, entirely healed the wound. Poor fellow, I doubt if he was ever so flattered in his life as by what I then said to him. This little incident, however, brought our political discussion to a close, for I would not dare to continue on what had become such tender ground. I could, therefore, not redeem my promise of showing him how the Conservative party might easily go to the country with a cry just as popular as could the wildest Radicals. But what I did not say to Sprigsby, I could say with less embarrassment here.’

‘But, my dear fellow,’ said the newly-created peer, ‘our great difficulty lies in this simple fact, that we are too high-minded to descend to agitation. We don’t understand this sort of thing. We are—well—well—as a matter of fact, we’re too gentlemanly for it.’

‘I hope,’ said Seacorts, ‘we may never have any need to take to it. I hope the common sense of the country may be only so sound and stable that there will be no need for our applying to it any sensational correctives. But if there be any ground for the vague alarms which, as we all know, are disturbing many people—if the future force in politics is to depend on sensational appeals addressed directly to the imagination of multitudes, as the Radical party are, beyond doubt, flattering themselves; then I should wish it to be realised by our party, and as soon as possible, that this is a game at which both parties can play, and that once let them take to real hard hitting, the Conservative blows would be probably much the hardest. Even at the present moment, despite all that is said on the other side, the English people is instinct with latent Conservatism. They have inherited it; it has been bred in them; it is the transmitted temperament of centuries, and they cannot get rid of it

lightly, even if they would. Take, for instance, that one great point that I have already spoken of, the home—the family, and marriage. Does anyone mean to say that the English nation, as a whole, has not a profound and passionate reverence for home and the marriage tie? Why, even the collier who kicks his wife would resent another man kicking her, and would resent still more another man making love to her. Under the hard outer skin of the whole English people there is a tissue of nerves of most extreme sensitiveness, and Radicalism will feel its weakness the moment it pricks this. The home is only one point. Property is another. The Englishman, poor or rich, adores property. One of the greatest desires of the poor is very often to accumulate; and even the man who never wished to save, would not submit to the tyranny that would make his saving a crime. It is to such a tyranny that Radicalism leads; and it is on this fact that I would, if necessary, fix the eyes of the people. I could show them that Radicalism, if consistent, must come to that; or else, if it is not consistent, then it is merely what I have just said it is, a class-selfishness, or a class-petulance, of the meanest and least popular kind, masquerading in a set of principles which it neither endorses nor understands. Some people fear Continental Socialism. In England I at least should not fear it. It would be powerful in England only as long as its real meaning was undistinguished. Without fear, then, and with the utmost confidence, I should direct the attention of the English to the whole programme of the Socialists; I should show them, what they would not be slow to see, that it was but the explicit statement of what Radicalism says implicitly; and I should then show them the tyranny that this programme embodied. It will break up your homes, I should say, it will rifle your money-boxes, it will whip you to your work, and it will whip you back to your play. It will leave you nothing you can call your own. It professes to be based on the abolition of property; and truly it will show itself even better than its word. It will not only take from a man his money, but his home, his wife, his children, his friends, and his affections, his choice, his freedom, and his will.

‘But,’ said Mrs. Hervey, ‘even suppose all this to be implied in Socialism, we always hear that it has made great way on the Continent. What reason have you for supposing that if it once reaches England it will not have equal influence here?’

‘I have many reasons,’ said Seacorts. ‘Nations, like individuals, have their special characters, and they command our trust or distrust in something the same way. The character of England is totally distinct from that of any Continental nation. It has been brought up in a different way, and its temper is the result of very different experiences. Between the aristocracy and the people of England there has never been any deep feud. Their mutual relationships have been almost unique in their kindliness; and such hard words

as may have been passed between them have rather proved the fundamental good feeling than so much as tended to disturb it. Such has been, and such is still, the characteristic of our nation; and in virtue of a temper like this England may still have an august mission before her. It may be hers to teach other nations, amongst all the excitement caused by maddening and impossible hopes, what is the rational, the sober, the humane course to pursue. And her past history will be a comment on her present example. She will stand forth as the embodiment of a sound and profound Conservatism—as, in literal truth, a saviour of society. But she will stand forth as more than this. She will declare that the reason why she is thus conservative is that she has always also been liberal. She is conservative because she has always been giving herself the best things to conserve. This is what I trust England will do; and the thought and the hope that she may do so is a thought fit to inflame the purest possible patriotism and the legitimate self-interest of all, from the lowest to the highest. Her only enemy is this diseased modern Radicalism, which is at present doing all it can to debauch the national imagination, and which, instead of taking as its aim the amelioration of inequalities, is trying to excite hopes of an impossible or a suicidal equality. Happily it will find in this country that it has set a hard task to itself; it will find, too, that its foes are they of its own household. In the ranks of these modern Radicals are to be found, we are told, not a few of our farmers. If this be true, what sort of farmers are they? Are they the farmers who lived in plenty because they lived in simplicity, or the farmers who a single bad season can paralyse, because they are always straining their incomes that they may make a show of gentility? They belong, I believe, chiefly to this latter class; and if they wish to live in a certain style I do not know that I have any right to blame them. But should such men raise any voice against our aristocracy, or demand any land reform of a socialistic tendency, then I should say to the people this: “Can you believe that such men as these are sincere in their protestations? Can you believe that on any sound principles they disapprove of an aristocracy, when the chief aims to which all their ambition is directed is to make their own lives an extremely unsuccessful imitation of it?” That is the sort of question I should like to put to the people. And yet no—I am wrong. I do not mean what I am saying. It is the question of all others I should not like to put. The thing of all others that I should really most shrink from is the use of any language that should set class against class. I have a large acquaintance amongst farmers myself; and the British farmer is full of admirable qualities. What you were saying, Lord —, is, I believe, quite true; and the British farmer at heart is as sound an aristocrat as any of us, and he respects his landlord’s position because he respects his own. True Conservatism would con-

ciliate every class, and true Liberalism would show it the way to do so. The great aim that States should have now before them, is not to destroy claims, or to shift classes, but to bring each class to its best; to give opportunity to all who *can* rise, and rational contentment to all who cannot, or to all who have no ambition to do so. And if I were ever again to address a constituency, the gist of my appeal would be very much like this: "I belong to a party that makes no irrational promises. We don't tell you that we have any nostrums for making this world a paradise. We believe, on the contrary, that there will be always suffering and disappointments in it. But at the same time we have all—we have every one of us—much that we would not lose; and we have much also that we certainly can mend. If, then, we have any good things that we treasure—homes, family ties, or religion—let us guard these things like Conservatives; if there are evils that we see our way to removing, let us try to remove them, like Liberals; and what we do not wish to conserve, but what we see no way to removing—these things let us bear like men."

W. H. MALLOCK.

ART NEEDLEWORK.¹

I.

DEAR SIR,—It is indeed well for the women of England without employment, or who when employed are only half paid, that public attention should be claimed for the question of their right to live, and their means for obtaining a maintenance according to their abilities.

If a woman is not strong enough to be a maid of all work, if she is not smart enough to wait behind a counter, nor ingenious enough to make bonnets, nor clever enough to keep a lodging-house, nor sufficiently educated to be a governess, nor sufficiently intellectual to translate foreign books into moderately good English, nor yet strong-minded enough to write novels that will sell, what is she to do? In each of these occupations the struggle 'for the survival of the fittest' is most severe, and those whom nature and education have not made strong enough to succeed must starve, or be supported by private charity, which is degradation, or by public charity, which means the workhouse. It has been said, and echoes through all time, that a woman's proper avocation is to 'suckle fools,' &c. But many more women are born than are needed for this laudable purpose; and so Providence has arranged that there should be a good many to spare for inferior uses. If the laws of marriage should be revolutionised (and the deceased wife's sister would be the thin end of the wedge), perhaps a moderate bigamy might be legalised, and so more fools would be the consequence, and more women would find occupation. Meanwhile the wisdom of ages only suggests one other alternative, 'Go spin, you jades.'

Women did spin, and they wove and worked too within the last fifty years, till steam, and the power loom, and machine embroidery wrested from them their 'woman's work,' and gave it to the strong man, that thenceforth all textile inventions should be manufactured by thousands of yards, to be paid for cheaply, and sold only a little

¹ This paper was written in reply to a letter asking information, and stating that a series of articles upon the remunerative employment of gentlewomen was contemplated for this Review.—ED.

less cheaply. From that time women have mostly served in herds as 'hands' in the crowded manufactories. I remember when I was young, more than half a century ago, seeing a beautiful girl at Tivoli who was much courted by the youth of the place as being industrious and capable, and likely to make an excellent wife. She sat at her loom weaving from daylight till midday, and then embroidered till sunset, when she arrayed herself in some of her own work and went to enjoy the public walk in all the bravery of her picturesque costume and the acknowledged supremacy of her loveliness, till the stars announced supper-time, after which she spun till midnight. Her name was Rosa Dante; and she enjoyed her own creations in coloured worsteds on linen she had herself woven, more than her great namesake ever enjoyed the creations of his own sad and majestic genius. We cannot dwell on these pleasant pictures of the past without wishing to revive them, as far as we may, for the benefit of at least some of our countrywomen.

But English girls are mostly ambitious. They are the boys' equals at the board-school classes, and help to cram their little brothers for the examinations, and though helping also the drudging mother at home, they despise her sordid life, and emulate for themselves a higher future. Some who, though very poor, belong to the better class, work at night in the Art School of their district, or they read for diplomas, and strive for college honours, admitted, though not yet awarded. They try to become doctors, and failing in that they fight the doctors on their common platform, the hospital ward, a melancholy sight for gods and men; they are all seeking to do good, but they are not yet entirely educated to the sense of what their position must be, and if we believe all that is said, it appears that there is none that doeth good—no, not one. Yet surely, if there is one thing that a woman ought to be fit for, it is the nursing of the sick, also the teaching of little children; but the schoolmaster is abroad everywhere, and the village schoolmistresses are few and far between. In both these professions the ranks are filled. There are already too many nurses and teachers: and the pretty and innocent crowd of girls who are still young enough to hope are pressing forward. They crush, many fall, and their cry is still for bread, and for the work to show for it. The strong man emigrates, but there is no phase of life in the Bush for women yet, though some of the colonies are beginning to send for domestic servants and wives.

Why repeat all this? The grievance is not new. It has been the subject of much eloquence and much nonsense, and of a little practical help. In your letter you inquire how far the Royal School of Art Needlework has advanced towards a partial solution of this problem, 'How to employ gentlewomen far removed from independence.' We may truly answer that it has set a fashion: and that is the first step towards creating an industry.

It is now only eight years since the school made a modest beginning in a small room in Sloane Street with twenty workers, all taught by Lady Welby with the assistance of Mrs. Dolby, who was already known as the authoress of a practical book on ecclesiastical embroidery. It was the urgent need for employment for women of education, born ladies, and reduced to poverty by the misfortunes or mistakes of their parents, that suggested this revival of decorative needlework. There was a blank also in the idle occupation of the rich woman who, nauseated with German patterns of Berlin wool work, had fallen back, like Queen Anne, to knitting and crochet. No wonder that the revival of 'crewels on linen,' and other more splendid material and work stitches, should have been hailed with delight, and that every woman embarked in a piece of so-called 'art needlework.' The name was new, the colouring and the stitches were old, and the style elastic enough to admit any degree of originality for the ambitious, or servile copying for the humble.

The little school grew so fast under the fostering care of its active president, H.R.H. the Princess Christian, that in the course of three years it had to be removed twice to more roomy quarters; and in 1875 it was finally settled in the Belgian Annexe in Exhibition Road, when the Queen graciously became the patron; and in 1878 it was formed into an incorporated association under the Board of Trade, with a president and vice-president, a manager and staff, and a council of management, a finance committee, and a fine-art sub-committee. No trouble has been spared to make it a permanent institution, as a school and as a centre for the recognised auxiliary art of decorative needlework in the United Kingdom.

Including the Branch School at Glasgow, the Royal School of Art Needlework gives permanent employment to about 135 ladies, of whom ninety are needlewomen; and these are always busy executing orders, and preparing work for amateurs or specimens for the show-room.

The studio employs about eighteen young artists, some of them pupils of the South Kensington School of Design. These leave the school when they find that they can obtain more satisfactory work elsewhere.

The very large correspondence and the necessarily somewhat intricate book-keeping are, under the manager, carried out by the assistant secretary, the accountant, and their assistants, seven in all. The actual embroidery is superintended by a most competent head, who has learnt her craft in foreign schools; under her are teachers in different styles; and lessons are given in private houses as well as in classes at the Royal School itself.

There is not space to enter into further details, but in answer to one of your questions I would state that an average worker earns about 25s. a week, a very good one about 27s., and the lowest, slowest,

or least able worker no more than 15s. This can hardly be called a living, but it is better than no occupation at all.

The Royal School of Art Needlework claims to be in every sense the mother school of the numerous branches, salerooms, and societies which have followed its lead. It preceded them all; it aroused the taste and style of the day, and continues to originate and to teach.² The School has published this year a Handbook of the Art of Embroidery, and lectures have been promised to be given at the school in the course of the coming season.

The school is an association, self-supporting and solvent, in spite of the general depression in trade of the last two years, which sensibly affected its financial prosperity, though the council was never forced to diminish the number of workers. It courts publicity as to the working of its organisation, and the council are always grateful for intelligent criticism. The financial department has received much generous help in gifts, and loans from members of the council and other friends, and these form the working fund; the loans will be eventually repaid, and we hope replaced by gradually accumulating working profits which, by the laws of the association, must be entirely placed to the benefit of the school itself, or the objects it had in view at its foundation.

I hope that this necessarily short, and therefore imperfect, statement may yet answer your questions, and justify the claim of the Royal School of Art Needlework to be a teacher and promoter of remunerative women's work, and to be the authority on the art of decorative needlework in the United Kingdom, as successors to the 'Broderers Company' incorporated and patronised by Queen Elizabeth in 1561.

I am tempted to say something as to the claims of needlework to be considered as Art. The fact is that so much weight and interest are now attached to all decorative art that hardly a review or a periodical appears that does not contain an article in which it is discussed. In Germany it has been most learnedly and fully treated by such men as Semper, Bock, and others. They have removed the study of archæology in art from the regions of frivolity and superficiality.

The study of style in even the smaller arts is no longer intended only to help graceful design, and please the eye and protect us from what is ugly or unbecoming. It is forced into the service of the scientific history of civilisation. And style as fully asserts itself in embroidery as in architecture or painting. If I may be allowed here to make a few remarks on the embroiderers of the past, I shall perhaps be able to strengthen my plea for the respect due to the efforts we are making to-day.

I have sought for information regarding our own art of embroidery,

* With what measure of artistic success the subjoined letter from Mr. Watts will testify better than any evidence from those connected with the School could do.

and I find that *Semper* gives it high pre-eminence as to antiquity, making it the foundation and starting-point of all art. He clothes not only *man*, but architecture with the products of the loom and the needle, and deduces from them in succession painting, bas-relief, and sculpture.

In the earliest dawn of civilisation the arts were the repositories of the myths and mysteries of national faiths. Embroidery was one of them, and the border which edged the garment of a divinity, and the veil which covered the grave of a loved one, or the flower-buds and fruit which fringed the hangings and curtains in the Sanctuary, each had a meaning, and therefore a use. These symbolical designs and forms were constantly reproduced, and all human ingenuity was exercised in reforming, remodelling, and adding perfect grace to the expression of the same idea.

Let us give some instances of symbolical patterns :—

The cross was a sign and a pattern in prehistoric art. It was the double of the Tau, the Egyptian emblem of life ; and while the Jews reject the Christian Cross, they still claim to have warned off the destroying Angel by this sign in blood over the lintels of their doors in the first Passover. The Gamma was the sacred letter of the Greeks, and arranged in different forms had different meanings. In the second form it was called the Gammadion, and under this name was woven into stuffs for ecclesiastical use, as late as the thirteenth century.

Can any invention of man show more intention than the wave-pattern ? The airy leap drawn downwards by the force of gravitation ; controlled, and again made to return, but strong to insist on its own curve of predilection, rushing back under the same circle ; strengthened by the downward movement to spring again from its original plane ; beginning afresh its Sisyphus labour, and facing the next effort with the same grace and agility. Undying force, and eternal flowing unrest—these are the evident intention of the wave-pattern. There is near Bologna an ancient Phœnician burial place. Many of the strangely formed tombstones have the wave-pattern roughly carved upon them. It is to be found wherever their universal commercial activity led them. Perhaps the pattern was sacred to the Phœnicians, who were always being borne over the sea, and to whom the wave must have been most familiar and significant.

Needlework has passed through many phases since the Aboriginal prehistoric woman with the bone needle, to which we have already alluded, drew together the edges of the skins of animals she had prepared for food.

For absolute necessity, in forming the garment and covering the tent, work need go no further than the seam. This, however, in the woven or plaited material must fray where it is shaped, and become fringed at the edges. Every long seam is a suggestion and every

shaped edge a snare. The fringe lends itself to the tassel, and the shaped seam suggests a pattern; up-stitches are needful for binding the web, and before she is aware of it, the worker finds herself adorning, embroidering.

The style of decoration called by the French 'Primitive' is the earliest known and classed, and is found in all savage attempts at ornament. It consists mainly of straight lines, zigzags, wavy lines, dots, and little discs.

Gold discs of many sizes, and worked with a variety of patterns, are found both in the tombs of Agamemnon at Mycenæ and in Ashantee, and the buttons remind one of those found in Etruscan tombs in design, though the execution is far more advanced and finer. They appear to be the origin of the clavis or nail-headed pattern woven into silks with gold in the Palace of the Cæsars. The last survival of this pattern recorded is in materials woven for Ecclesiastical purposes in the middle ages.

Of very early art we can only obtain here and there a glimpse by passing allusions in early poetry, illustrated by fragments of early art.

We know not what the actual heroes of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* wore; but we do know that what Homer describes he must have seen. Was Homer, therefore, the contemporary of the siege of Troy? or does he describe the customs and costumes of his own time, and apply them to the traditions of the heroic ages of Greece? Of the uncertain date of Homer himself we can reconstruct the house and the hall, and even furnish them: and clothe the women and the princes, the beggars and the herdsmen, with help from contemporary art.

From the remains of Egyptian, Babylonian, and Assyrian art, we can guess at their different styles, and perceive their affinities. Of these it would be difficult to date any very ancient fragments, as there was probably but little change of style in an art which in the East was essentially consecutive and imitative.

The Babylonian and Ninevite embroideries have a masculine look, which suggests the design of an artist and the work of slaves. There is no following out of vague fancies; one set of selected forms, each probably with a symbolical intention, following another. The effect, as seen on the bas-reliefs in the British Museum, is royally gorgeous, and one feels that creatures inferior to monarchs and satraps, could never have aspired to such splendours. Probably the embroideries on their garments were executed in gold wire, treated as thread, and taken through the linen, and the same system was carried out in adorning the trappings of the horses and chariots. The solid masses of embroidery may have been afterwards subjected to the action of the hammer which would account for their appearing like jeweller's work in the bas-reliefs.

The corslet given by Amasis, King of Egypt (according to Herodotus), to the temple of Minerva, at Rhodes, was probably worked in this style, for Babylonian embroidery was greatly prized in Egypt, and imitated. The second corslet given by Amasis to the Lacedæmonians was worked in gold and colours, with animals and other decorations. This was in the seventh century B.C. Amongst the arms painted in the tombs of Rameses at Thebes (in Egypt), is a corslet apparently of rich stuff embroidered in colours with lions and other devices.

The fine linens which the Jews, more than a thousand years before this date, carried with them from Egypt are all gone to decay. We can only judge of this wonderful material from a very few fragments of the wrappings of mummy-cloths, and of their embroidery from some morsels in the museum of Turin and the Louvre; but the hangings of the Tabernacle are so carefully described in the book of Exodus, that we can see in fancy the linen curtains, blue or white, embroidered in scarlet, blue, purple, and gold; the cherubim in the woven material; the fringes enriched with flowers, buds, fruit, and golden bells.

Deborah sings of 'divers colours of needlework on both sides, fit for the necks of those that divide the spoil,' as being part of the anticipated plunder which Sisera was to bring home. It is curious that this work, 'the same on both sides,' still prevails in that part of the East.

It is touching to read of the Babylonian embroidered garment which tempted Achan at the fall of Jericho, and brought such a terrible expiation on himself and all that belonged to him.

David describes the bride as the 'king's daughter all glorious within. Her clothing is of wrought gold. She shall be brought before the king in raiment of needlework.' If the bride is really the prophetic type of the visible Church, how truly has she appeared for many centuries adorned with needlework and cloth of gold.

Greek embroideries we can perfectly appreciate by studying 'Hope's Costumes of the Ancients,' Millingen's works, &c., also the Greek fictile vases in the British Museum. On these are depicted their gods, their heroes, their wars, and their home life. The worked or woven patterns on their draperies are infinitely varied, and range over several centuries of design—and they are almost always beautiful. It is melancholy to have to confess that in this, as in all their art, the Greek taste is inimitable; yet we may profit by the lessons it teaches us. These are variety without redundancy; grace without affectation; simplicity without poverty; the appropriate, the harmonious, and the serene; rather than that which is painful, astonishing, or awful. These principles were carried into the smallest arts, and we can trace them in the shaping of a cup or the decoration of a mantle as in the frieze of the Parthenon itself.

Homer makes constant mention of the women's work; Penelope's web is oftenest quoted. This was a shroud for her absent lord. Ulysses, however, brought home a large collection of fine embroidered dresses, contributed by his different fair hostesses during his travels.

Pallas Athene, who patronised the craft of the embroiderers in Athens, appeared to Ulysses in the steading of Eumæus the swine-herd as 'a woman fair and tall, and skilful in splendid handiwork,' and Helen gave of her own needlework to Telemachus. 'Helen, the fair lady, stood by the coffer wherein were her robes of curious needlework, which she herself had wrought. Then Helen, the fair lady, lifted one, and brought it out; the widest and most beautifully embroidered of all, and it shone like a star,' and this she sent as a marriage gift to his future wife.

The great ladies in Persia did not work themselves, but left it to their slaves—witness the pretty story of Alexander's gift to the family of Darius, with the advice that they should embroider the mantles of Grecian materials. They were much hurt, feeling that it was a suggestion of slavery. When he was aware of this, he said he had intended to do them honour, as the materials had been woven by the women of his own family. We may here mention, whilst on the subject of Persia, that Lucullus brought back from thence, as a part of his pillage, 5,000 suits of embroidered and other clothes. Horace says that he gave them to the theatrical wardrobes of Rome.

I suppose there is little doubt that all the Romans knew or felt of art was borrowed, directly or indirectly, from Greece, first through Etruscan and Phœnician sources, and finally by conquest. Everything we have of their art shows their imitation of Grecian models. Had we any of their embroideries they would assuredly have shown the same impress.

Greece, herself crushed and demoralised, had to send her artists, as well as her accumulated treasures of art, to Rome; and, even so late as the Eastern empire, gave her the fashion of the Byzantine taste, which she at once adopted, and called it the Romanesque. This style, which was partly Arab, became European, and still prevails in Russian art, having clung to the Greek Church.

At Ravenna one learns much of the dress of this early Christian period from the mosaics in the churches. The Empress Theodora and her ladies appear to be clothed in Indian materials. These had long been drifting into Europe by the Red Sea. Ezekiel mentions the Indian trade through Aden (500 B.C.) Theodora's dress has a deep border of gold embroidered with Roman warriors pursuing each other with drawn swords. Works enriched with precious stones now appear for the first time and testify to their Oriental origin.

The next European phase was the Gothic; this is Arab and Moresque, steeped in Northern ideas; and finding its congenial soil, it grew into the most splendid, thoughtful, and finished style—far

transcending anything that it borrowed originally from Eastern or Southern sources.

All these transitions were accompanied by the service of the smaller decorative arts, mosaics, ivories, and jeweller's and smith's work in metals; and last, and not least, splendid embroideries to adorn the altars and vestments of the priests, and the dresses of monarchs and nobles.

When taste was imperfect or declined, then the carvings were rude, and the embroideries likewise: but when all these crafts rose again and added to themselves grace and beauty, by study and by experience, then needlework in England, Germany, France, Italy, and Spain, grew and flourished.

Then came the Reformation, which in Germany and England gave a sad blow to the arts which had reserved their best efforts for the Church; and the change of style effected by the Renaissance was not suited to the solemnity of ecclesiastical decoration. The styles of the fifteenth and sixteenth century embroideries adapt themselves better for secular purposes; though their extreme beauty as architectural ornament in Italy reconciles one to their want of religious character, on the principle that it was allowable to give to the Church all that in its day was brightest and most precious.

The style of those centuries was called sometimes the Arabesque, and sometimes the Grotesque. The fashion was really copied from the excavated palaces and tombs of the best Roman era. Raphael admired them, and caused his pupils to imitate and copy them, and they influenced all decorative art for a considerable period.

Spanish and Portuguese embroideries of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries are especially fine. Their Renaissance, which went by the name of the *Plâteresque*, is a style apart. The reason of its name is that it seems to have been originally intended for, and is best suited to, the shapes and decoration of gold and silver plate. It is extremely rich and ornate, not so appropriate to architecture as to the smaller arts, and wanting perhaps in the simplicity which gives dignity. The style called *Louis-Quatorze*, following on the Renaissance in Germany, England, Spain, Italy and France, assumed modifications which served to distinguish them, but into which we have not time to enter now. In this style France took the lead and appropriated it, and rightly named it after the magnificent monarch who fostered it. This was a splendid era, and its furniture and wall decorations, dress, plate, and books, shine in all the fertile richness and grace of French artistic ingenuity. The new style asserted itself everywhere and remodelled every art, but the long reign of *Louis Quatorze* gave the fashion time to wane and change. Under *Louis XV.* the defects increased and the beauties diminished. The fine heavy borders were broken up into fragmentary forms. All flow and strength were eliminated, and what remained of the *Louis-Quatorze*

style became, under its next phase, only remarkable for the sparkling prettiness which is inherent in all French art.

In Italy this sixteenth century style became what is called the 'Sette-cento,' and was a chastened imitation or appropriation of the Spanish Plâteresque and the French Louis-Quatorze. In Germany it was a decided heavy copy of both, of which there are splendid examples in the adornment of the German palaces, royal and episcopal. In England was faintly reflected the continental taste during the reign of Queen Anne and the first Georges, but except in the upholstery of the family of Chippendale, and one or two palaces, such as Blenheim and Castle Howard, we did not produce much that was original in the style of that day.

Under Louis XV., Boucher and Watteau, in France, produced designs that were well suited to tapestries and embroideries. All the heathen gods, with cupids, garlands, floating ribbons, crowns, and cyphers, were everywhere carved, gilded, and worked. It was the visible tide of the frivolity in which poor Marie Antoinette was drowned; though before the Revolution she had somewhat simplified the forms of decoration; and straight lines instead of curves, and delicacy rather than splendour, had superseded, at least at court, the last efforts of royal palatial furnishing and taste.

This was followed by the Revolution, and then came the attempt at classical severity (so contrary to the French nature) which the Republic affected. Dress was adorned with embroidered spots and Etruscan borders, and the ladies wore diadems, and tried to be as like as possible to the Greek women painted in fictile art. Napoleon attempted a dress which was supposed to be Roman, at his coronation. Trophies were woven and embroidered; and the honeysuckle, key, and egg-and-anchor patterns were everywhere. With the Empire the classical taste collapsed, and the Egyptian, Greek, and Roman furniture and materials fell to hotels and lodging-houses. In most of the palaces on the Continent an apartment is still to be seen furnished in this style. It was the necessary tribute of flattery to the great conqueror, who in that character inhabited so many of them for a short space. But there was no sign of the style being taken up *con amore* anywhere out of France.

We have reached the middle of the second decade of our own century, and we cannot now enter into all the causes that have led to the revival of embroidery in England, and of Art in general in its present phase.

It is really a conglomerate of preceding styles, suited to our new archæological tastes and ideas, in which the antique, the baroc, and the rococo each have a share, and are harmonised apparently by careful colours and neutral forms, which do not assert any especial date of design. But out of these elements possibly a real and accentuated style may be crystallising around us, without our being

conscious of its existence, so that a hundred years hence a genuine work of to-day may be recognisable by an absolute 'cachet' of its own.

The Art Committee of the Royal Society of Art Needlework is fully aware of its own responsibilities, and strives to keep and raise a standard which shall assist to guide and inform the decorative tendency of our day.

I remain, dear Sir,

Yours truly obliged,

MARIAN ALFORD,

Vice-President of the Royal School of Art Needlework.

ART NEEDLEWORK.

II.

DEAR LADY MARIAN,—I have been much gratified and indeed surprised by what I saw in your school of needlework at South Kensington. An amount of perfection has been reached which I was by no means prepared for ; indeed, it is difficult to imagine how anything of the kind can be better than some representations of plumage and of leafage I saw worked in silk and in what I think is called crewel.

Needlework, which has been woman's occupation since the days of Penelope, is worthy on its own account of vigorous efforts to preserve its vitality. As one of the best means of carrying taste into household surroundings, it cannot be too highly prized ; as affording honourable employment to many whose condition must be a source of great pain to all but the most thoughtless, it takes a place among the important considerations of the time. The necessity to work is far more widely extended than formerly, and every lady knows with what peculiar hardship it falls in many cases. A wide employment in use of needlework would supply a means of relieving pressing need in a better manner than anything that could be invented. Having executive skill at command, two other things only are wanted, designs and purchasers. Beautiful designs you can always get for money, but it is not so easy to create a demand. It can hardly be expected that an age which sets so little store by the charm of beauty for its own sake, and fails to perceive practical value in art of any kind, will take much interest in your school until its practical value can be demonstrated and generally felt. And this will take time ; the impulse that will carry you through and establish your position must come from the sympathy of those who may be expected meanwhile to thoroughly appreciate your objects.

It seems to me that as it has been, it must be, for at least some time—woman's work : a word of more limited signification may be used—ladies' work, and a work that every lady in the land should take up. All honour to those who have worked so hard, and created a school of such ability.

And now the ladies of England should make it a point of honour to carry the work through. An effort on their part might well be made, and something spared out of what is not seldom employed on things that yield but little real satisfaction—something spared and devoted in order to encourage a fashion that might become an important agent in our real civilisation while holding out a hand of help to some among others (though sisters all) whose position in the social scale places them literally within such hand's reach.

This real sympathy is not too much to ask for or expect. Our little life is poor indeed if bounded by our own personal requirements and fancied requirements; and serious reflection enforces the conclusion that perhaps what we leave undone is a more weighty matter than what we do. What we do is often the result of misconception, of pressure, of the insanity of excitement, of haste; what we leave undone we have had time to think over and reject. Habitual indifference to the right may be more culpable than hurried plunges into wrong. There are few who would not shrink awestruck from the certainty of witnessing the end of the world by physical convulsion, few, if it befell, standing on such a brink, who would not regret their best feelings had not been more active; yet to each the end of the world will surely come; every tick of the clock may be counted as an audible footfall, as step by step we pass on the road. And if, at the end, it should be asked not only what active evil we have done, but whether we have seen any fallen by the way, or drowning, without extending our hands to save, will it go well with us? And before this, if the end of the world come not while we are young, are there not two ways of growing old? Equally inevitable the end; tottering and stumbling, still groping in the ground till we mix with it in the darkness, or rising, as some aeronaut, the world sliding gradually away, leaving us as we still rise with more extended view, while in the grand space the things that seemed so mighty take their relative proportions—towns and cities lose their individuality, and become part of the great whole, and the contention of life, better understood, comes with a confused hum, not altogether unmusical, up in the tranquil atmosphere, free from the impurities of the lower air. Such is the evening of a noble life, like mercy 'twice blessed,' blessed by its own good works, and blessed by the affectionate loyalty of the benefited.

It seems to me not seldom that the evening of our life as a powerful nation comes on apace, and I would that the eyes of younger nations should follow our progress with admiration. This will be if a great national spirit can be encouraged to animate us all.

In the case of your school I should have an appeal made to the ladies of England, some earnest reminder how many anxieties may be relieved, how much taste diffused, by a little active but widely spread co-operation on their part. If the queens of fashion would (as they

could do) make the practice of needlework fashionable, everything you strive for would be attained. Of course you must have the best designs the most accomplished masters can give you ; that alone will keep up the character and extend the influence of your institution as a school of art ; and it is of paramount importance that your school should be able to show examples of the best that can be done. But I should like to make a step in a side direction.

Art, and especially such art, to fulfil its mission, should have a thoroughly natural and home side. She must not always be introduced with a flourish of trumpets by a professor, not always sit in a chair of state, or be treated like a visitor, for whom we put on our sedate manners and ceremonious apparel ; she must be one of the ordinary household, consulted upon domestic matters, with her sleeves tucked up, busied in the kitchen, and very much at home in the nursery, not merely a friend of the family, but one of the family. This cannot be if Puritanic severity be at all times insisted on ; a thing may be

Too great and good
For human nature's daily food ;

and we no more at all times want the perfection of professional art than we at all times want professional music, professional billiards or professional lawn tennis. The standard may be raised so high as to render endeavour hopeless, and in this way much of the healthy and recreative essence of art dissipated.

The best, and that which will remain as a landmark for all time in art and music, must surely be professional, for such production is the work of a life. But taste may be too fastidious and exacting, making at all times demands which should be reserved for certain occasions. To sing and play out of time and tune should not be tolerated, but singing and playing with but little voice and execution will, on fit occasions, and if in good taste, often give very great pleasure.

There is no interest like personal interest, and I should like to see ladies sending, for *their own special use*, their own designs to be worked—'ladies' own (intellectual) materials made up'—not in competition with professional art. Many a lady whose interest is too languid to feel more than a passing pleasure even in the very best specimens of beautiful work, would find much natural gratification in having her own room beautified by her own designs produced in needlework. If such a fashion could be stimulated, the best results might be expected. Attempts to produce designs with this object, while they would excite liveliness of interest in art work, would at the same time sharpen observation of natural beauty and variety ; and intellectual, interested observation of natural beauty in curves, of graceful combinations of line, which might often be copied without change, might be expected to go far towards correcting errant taste in dress, and supplying

for it some definite principles. And, indeed, in designing for needlework the amateur might often successfully compete with the professor, as in the lighter branches of literature; the technical knowledge and acquired skill of the painter are not necessary, and taste and fancy have not to contend hopelessly with the difficulties of execution.

In decoration, especially needlework decoration, a moderate amount of artistic acquirement, assisting natural sensibility, might often achieve very satisfactory results. Guided by a few simple rules, many a lady with but the ordinary habit of drawing might find herself producing very graceful designs, which, if not possessing sufficient fibre to bear public criticism, would be very pleasant in her own house. Professors of all kinds incline to look coldly on the amateur element, dreading it as antagonistic to true and severe study. I think, on the contrary, in art especially, it is to be encouraged, creating as it does a lively interest in many, in addition to and not diminishing the earnestness that can only be felt by few.

Before the art of writing was commonly practised, people went to a professional letter-writer to convey what they had to say. Here I think I perceive some resemblance. The general habit of writing one's own letters has not struck at the root of literature.

A few simple principles may be laid down, such as avoidance of all forms that will not adapt themselves to undulations of surface and change of direction of plane, also all forms that suggest decay, all that makes an appeal to the emotional and intellectual side of our impressions. Such things are out of place on furniture, drapery, &c.; the graceful alone is desirable—those things which are suggestive of youth, and light, and enjoyment. Representations of creations that are beautiful in form and gorgeous in colour, birds, butterflies, beetles, &c., can be worked with very great perfection, and may be rendered with as much or as little actual truth as the occasion may require, to be used in furniture, decoration, or in dress; and it is but reasonable to expect that such application of design and industry would bring about the abolition of the barbarous and abominable practice of destroying myriads of exquisite birds. A whole creation of loveliness is in danger of being swept from off the face of the earth, for the object of sticking stuffed specimens about wearing apparel, where they are, notwithstanding their supreme beauty, wholly in bad taste, the extreme improbability of the real creature's presence in such places making the effect more grotesque than charming. But while the appearance of the stuffed bird perched on a lady's muff or entangled in her skirts is absurd or disagreeable, the beautiful and acknowledged imitation could be worn with perfectly good taste, and here should be a most lucrative source of employment, not demanding expensive outlay for designs—shining and beautiful things in thousands which, as acknowledged imitations, would work into dress ornaments with great effect, and with how

much gain ! First, the study of the exquisite creation and consequent artistic improvement ; secondly, employment given ; thirdly, improvement in ornamentation and effect in dress ; fourthly, a right direction of expenditure in such matters ; and, fifthly (if but occasionally), awakened conscience as to right direction of such expenditure. All this and more ; for evermore does one habit lead to another and shape us body and soul.

G. F. WATTS.

THE CREED OF A LAYMAN.

ONE of the hardest of the many hard sayings of Auguste Comte is this: *Man becomes more and more religious*. People look back to history, to the times of the early Christians, or the mediæval saints, to the Bible heroes or the authors of the Evangelical revival, and they deny the truth of this. In the growing abandonment of all theological belief by so many persons here, and by so many more in Europe, in the emptying of the chapels and the churches, in the visible advance all along the line of Atheism, Agnosticism, Materialism, and Secularism, it certainly does seem that Man is growing less and less religious, at least in one meaning of that term.

Far more than this. The schools of thought which are most in the ascendant are continually reducing the sphere of Religion to a minimum, and many of them systematically discard it—seek to free human life from religion altogether. Many teachers, either openly or silently, consciously or unconsciously, would substitute for religion, Science, Free Thought, Common Sense, the Infinite, or the Unknowable.

Notwithstanding all this, Positivism—which is popularly supposed to be Materialism, Secularism, or Atheism; which is most certainly *Positive*, i.e. scientific, which accepts no Revelation, no imaginary beings or worlds, trusting to the *real*, to this world and this life; which has nothing to say about the Creation or direction of the universe, or about a Celestial existence after death—this Positivism still continues to repeat with perfect firmness and confidence, ‘Yes! *Man does become more and more religious*.’

It is plain that we are using religion in some different sense, not in the sense in which it is popularly used to-day, when it is taken to imply divine beings and extra-tellurian life. We are using it in the true and real sense, in the old meaning; that meaning which, in the shrinking process, in the retreat along its whole line, Theology has abandoned. Still, we say, that this is the true and original meaning of Religion—that which Religion all along in theory has ever claimed to be; and when it is candid, feels that it ought to be.

That meaning of Religion is this. It is a scheme of thought and life whereby the whole nature of individual men and societies of

men are concentrated in common and reciprocal activity, with reference to a Superior Power which men and societies alike may serve. In popular use the latter phrase alone in the definition has survived; and that in a particular aspect of it. When the various qualities of a man, and of masses of men, can be brought to work together to a great common object of Devotion—then you have Religion.

The essence of the idea is, that the faculties can all be brought by it into harmony and proper relation; that it binds up great multitudes in one feeling and one thought.

But to put aside for a moment any discussion about terms, to take this idea, this harmony of the whole nature and welding together of society, to use a phrase which was invented by a great master of expression, this 'consolidation of co-operation' (religion is really that and nothing else), it is manifest that this harmony indeed increases from age to age.

In the old pre-historic ages there was no harmony within man, when he was the wild untutored (it may be the noble) savage. There could be no true unity of classes under Caste, or Brahminism, under Slavery, in the ages of systematic conquest, in the moral anarchy and intellectual inequality of the Greco-Roman world. Is there harmony and unity under Islamism, was there in the feudal class system, or in the arbitrary, mystical, spasmodic era of Catholicism? Could there be any real harmony in Protestantism and Dissent, which mean divergence, dispute, conflict? Could there be unity anywhere until Science had asserted its independence of blind faith, until Industry had gained the victory over War, until the people had won their full and equal place in modern society?

Now Classes are being swallowed up in the Republic; races and nations are being brought together; industry, science, humanity, are slowly asserting their superiority. The solidarity of Peoples, the Federation of mankind, or what is foreshadowed by such terms, is an idea which grows. The 'consolidation of co-operation' is at hand. Unity of classes and races, harmony in the realm of thought and feeling are only now becoming practicable hopes. It is hardly in modern life, only indeed in the Future, that we can see as a vision, the true unity of the race, the harmonious concentration of Thought and Life.

If we mean by Religion that which makes man more complete, which makes societies united, it is plain that we are more and more converging towards this state.

Those who say, 'Leave this convergence to itself, it is not a thing to strive for; the destiny of man is one of infinite differentiation without any corresponding process of co-ordination'—such men are talking against all the facts, the experience, and instincts of human nature.

Civilisation implies increasing co-ordination, consensus, and

sympathy of the vast human organism ; though it be indeed a subtler co-ordination, a more rational consensus, a more equable sympathy.

• We need not argue with those who can contemplate with patience, can actually promote, the state of discord, cross-purpose and confusion in the spirit of man ; the disruption and antagonism between societies of men.

This can mean nothing but waste of our human faculties, struggle, and antipathy, not 'peace and good-will amongst men.' It is needless to argue such a theme—for every system of belief, philosophy, all schemes of society, morality, social progress, theories of civilisation, and plans of reform—all imply *some* discipline of our social nature—*some* bond to unite society.

So far we are pretty much agreed, at least all rational and serious persons are—that human nature must be got to work with the minimum of waste—and society with the minimum of friction, the maximum of correlation. But then the non-theological schools of the day are for the most part content to trust for this : either to some purely intellectual doctrine or doctrines : some say Science, some Truth, some say the principle of Evolution, or logical examination ; some vaguely say Free-Thought, the Spirit of Inquiry, the right of Private Judgment, some mystical gift for always being right of which we have never learned the secret.

Or, if they give up this, they practically trust to chance, and say human nature will work it all right in the end.

No doubt it will : but we must give human nature its fair chance, and accept what it demands ; and if human nature calls out for Religion, religion it must have or die.

Trusting to luck, or chance, or the ultimate triumph of what is called Truth, almost all the non-theological schools, disciples of Science, of Free Thought, of Democracy, of Secularism, and the like, repudiate anything like an organised attempt to reduce life as a whole to harmony by a central principle of life ; they reject systematic discipline of life : they start back from Worship, from any formal appeal to the Feelings, from the very idea of Devotion of spirit to a great Power—in a word they turn with disgust or mockery from Religion.

Not indeed that they have ever proved this to be the sum of Philosophy, or the true teaching of History. Far from it, they assume it ; they affect to know it by the Light of Nature as an intuitive truth. Mention to them *worship*, *devotion*, *religion*, the discipline of heart and practice in the continuous service of the object of devotion—in a word utter the word Religion—and they smile in a superior and satisfied way.

All the teaching of History, the entire logic of Philosophy, the perennial yearnings of the human heart, the intensest hopes of the best men and the best women, all these are against them. Philo-

sophy means just putting one's thoughts into relation with each other, and with the facts and circumstances of human nature. Wherever in the story of mankind a grand epoch or movement is seen, there we have passionate devotion working with an overpowering belief at the bottom of it. Charlemagne and Alfred, Cromwell and Washington, St. Louis and Hildebrand, St. Paul, Mahomet, Confucius, Moses, were men whose whole natures were fused through and through—brain, heart, and will, all together by that which was at once to them Thought—Resolve—Love. They moved men and created epochs—not because they had got hold of some particular truth, or not merely by that, but because their mighty natures had been kindled with a high passion—because their lives were seen to be transfigured in its light.

Wherever around us to-day we see a beautiful character and a noble life, there we see something more than a set of opinions and implicit reliance on the principle of free inquiry. What is it that we do see? We always find a passionate resolve to make life answer in fact to some end that is deeply believed to be right. We have the three things—belief—enthusiasm—practice.

Why, if we really wish something to act on the lives of men, why are we to surrender any one of these agents—belief, enthusiasm, practice? We want them all. All are not enough. To neglect any one is to leave human life one-sided, maimed, and incomplete. We can all see how empty is enthusiasm without knowledge and intelligence; how dry and formal is practice without enthusiasm. How is it that we fail to see how poor a thing is knowledge without enthusiasm and without practice?

The Revolt against the old faiths has been carried out blindly—too violently. Those who would sweep away Religion merely mean to sweep away the theological phase of religion. Those who repudiate Worship are simply dissatisfied with the old objects of Worship. To rebel against the ecclesiastical discipline of life is not to prove that life should have no discipline. To cease to venerate an unthinkable Creator and an unspeakable Mystery is not to cease to be capable of veneration towards anything. If our hearts feel void within us when we are bid to serve God, does this mean that our hearts are doomed to a void for ever? If our Faith in things supernatural is slipping from under us, does this mean that we must live for ever in this world of to-day without any Faith, with no Hope, no sense of Devotion to anything anywhere?

It is the delirium of revolt which screams out to us to cast out the faculty and the habit of faith along with the object or the form of our old faith. Besides it is cant: mere delusion to suppose it is done, or can be done. Neither enthusiasm, nor discipline, nor faith, nor reverence, nor devotion to a cause, nor love for a Power greater than ourselves, are at all dying out in the world. They are not

growing weaker. They are even in the midst of change, growing wider, deeper, more universal.

The political and social movements of our age show us as noble examples of unselfish devotion to a cause as any in history. The martyrs of science, of industry, of civilisation and progress, are of that same old stuff whose blood has of yore watered churches. Patriotism is a living passion. Our humanity deepens and widens, our sympathy grows tenderer, our earnestness to keep fresh the memory of the great dead grows more into a habit. Our civilisation is more conscious of its high destiny and its accumulating Duty.

The Schools that are the most eager to uproot all religion are themselves conspicuous for enthusiasm, devotion, self-sacrifice. No men have come nearer to the spirit of religious martyrs in our modern times than some of those devotees of the socialist, communist, democratic Gospel. The very Nihilists have shown us wonderful examples of discipline and faith. The Atheists, the Secularists, the Materialists stand almost first beyond the believers in creeds in constancy, fervour, and what a Christian would call an earnestness to save souls; and in nothing are they more conspicuous than in devoted reverence and submission to the heroes and teachers of their choice.

There is as much capacity for reverence in the world as ever—as much and more—scattered and incongruous as the objects of reverence have become. There is as much zeal, and force of heart, as much power of devotion as ever, as much capacity for association as ever. No moralist, no politician, no reformer for an instant doubts the power of ideas, the value of discipline, the temper of devotion, and none of them certainly propose to forego the appeal to these. Man does become more and more religious in the range and universality of the religious instinct.

All this capacity for religious unity is checked in the present day by the prevailing theories. What has happened is that knowledge and belief do not range with devotion; practice is out of joint with profession; and reverence itself bears the standard in Revolt.

Positivism is a scheme for bringing all these three—belief, discipline, worship—again (or rather for the first time) really into line, and training this consolidated force to bear on Life and on Society. It says: ‘Man has a mind, and an enormous accumulation of knowledge. We have to satisfy that mind, and give order to that knowledge. Man has energies; we must give them a full scope, and yet keep them in due bounds. Man has a soul fitted for great devotion; we must fill that soul with a worthy object of devotion, strengthen it, purify it by constant exercise. If we leave out one of these sides, human nature is cramped, harmony is destroyed. And what is more, not only must all three sides be appealed to alike, but they must be appealed to by some great principle that can inspire them in one work.’

If this *can be* done, it is plain how enormous must be its power over life. If there be such a principle, all else in human nature is of little moment till we have it. If harmony in the whole nature *be* possible, it must be the supreme good dreamed of by the philosophers of old. It must be happiness, duty, wisdom, peace, and life all in one.

And why, because we live in the midst of revolt against superstition and formalism, why are we to assume so confidently that there is no such harmony, that human nature shall drag on in the oscillations of eternal conflict, in misunderstanding and crossed purpose, for ever till this planet chills into its last phase of silent ice? Why take for granted this tremendous and terrible fate? Why do we not turn to any shadow of divinity that is left us? Why do we not cling to God, Church, Book, and call upon Jehovah, Jove, or Lord, or (if men prefer it) call upon science, philosophy, progress, and all the spirits of our age to tell us if such a thing *be*, or *be not*? Strange that we do not all, day and night, incessantly seek for the answer to this, of all questions the most vital: 'Is there anything by which man can order his life as a whole? Is there anything by which our nature may gain its unity, our race may acknowledge its brotherhood?' Why do we not make up our mind, or try to make it up? Why do we not resolve in which camp we will stand? How long shall we halt between two opinions?

It is mockery to talk about science, enlightenment, progress, free thought, to the myriads of men and women, and to tell them that these ought to serve them. What can they want more—why ask for religion? The rude men who sweat and swelter in mines, in furnaces and factories, the hedger and the ditcher, and the cottager with his pinched home, the women who stitch and serve, the children wandering forlorn and unkempt into rough life, how are these to be sustained and comforted by science and enlightenment? How will *free thought* teach discipline to the young, and self-restraint to the wild? What sustenance will the imaginative and the devotional nature receive from the principle of free inquiry? Human nature is not a thing so docile and intellectual that it can be tamed by fine thoughts; nor is society amenable to pure ideas. It is playing with the question to offer us anything less than a systematic philosophy, a grand and over-mastering object of reverence, a resolute scheme of social and personal practice.

Positivism does offer these. What else is there that does? We speak, of course, to those who have deliberately, on one ground or other, put aside Church and book, ritual and creed. We would disturb the faith of none who are satisfied in these. Here are the two questions?

I. Can we expect to see the real regeneration of human life (we speak to none who do not desire this) if we deliberately forego that

which has been at the bottom of every regeneration of life—an appeal to the undying instinct of reverence, devotion, in the human heart?

II. Where can we place that devotion, so that it be an integral part of modern *science* and modern *society*, unless it be in the ever present image of that Humanity, of which we are children and servants?

The problem is this—Human life and society are in want of a revivifying and reforming force.

The force of a great devotion has been the most potent of all reforming powers.

It must be a devotion that wholly satisfies and coincides with scientific, logical intellect; and, therefore, must be not superhuman.

It must be one that wholly satisfies and appeals to our practical energy, our craving for work and life on earth; and therefore, it must be not supra-telluric.

Now the old creeds, Bible and Salvation, no longer even seem to satisfy these latter conditions.

I will not say that these have been thrust aside by science and industry. Rather they have themselves slipped out of the way, fled from science and industry—got themselves out of sight and out of mind, retreated to some cloud-capt and inaccessible mountains, far away from life, never to return.

The old law of Bible and Salvation having abdicated, resigned (in the earthly field of Thought and Work, in the real and the practical world), what remains?

Free inquiry, interminable free inquiry, scepticism, indifferentism, research and then more research, waiting for something to turn up, whilst, all the while, vice, ignorance, strife, moral helplessness and mental indecision do not wait, but grow and enlarge. Or else (and this is the alternative) the devotion of brain, and heart, and energy to the service of that Mighty Power which stands beside us day and night, of which every act and thought of ours is but the reflection, the aggregate force of the lives of true men in the past, the present, and the future, in which civilisation is incarnate and lives a continuous and visible life.

What else is there but this, if the sons of this age of light and labour are to have devotion at all?

There is much talk now about what some ingenious person has named 'Fervent Atheism,' and it is declared that fervent Atheism is a contradiction in terms. I am inclined to agree with this in a literal sense. The idea of basing a really devotional frame of mind, or any working enthusiasm of a genuine kind, on any negation is truly ludicrous. But to pass from Atheism or the assertion that there is no God—to pure Agnosticism (that you know nothing about God or any other object of worship), or to Evolution or the laws of matter, or in-

finite differentiation, or the Unknowable, or the Universum, as Strauss calls it, or the Infinite as some metaphysicians say, or the All, or the Good, or any other ideal of the inanimate world; how utterly hollow is the notion that any real enthusiasm can be based on this! We need something that we conceive able to reach our human sympathies, to be of nature akin to our own, something that we can really commune with in a moral union—something living not dead—organic not inert. That is the hollowness of Pantheism in every form.

Look at things which *have* touched sympathies. The Church, the Chosen People, the Roman race, the city of Athens, of Sparta, Christendom, Islam, the Bible, the Republic, the Socialist Utopia, all of these *have* been the basis of true creeds, real enthusiasm, practical working religions. They have spoken to men face to face. And now when they or many of them are passing away; when Bible, Christendom, Islam, the Church, are all fading into the pages of history as the creed of Abraham and Isaac, and the divinity of Rome, of Athens and Sparta, have faded; now when we see how narrow, partial, inadequate is each of these, how wanting in breadth and continuity even is the ideal Republic, even our own contemporary human race—what is there left, I say, what other idea can become the basis of a mundane faith but the idea of *Humanity*, which includes all? The collective destiny of men in the past, the present, and the future, is the real whole of which all these smaller ideas are but the broken reflections, or germs, is broadly human in its spirit, and touches the profoundest chord of sympathy. It is a power towards which we can feel the sense of brotherhood, and sonhood, and loyal sense of service.

What else is there to love and serve—if we seek to love and serve the greatest loveable and serveable thing on this earth, and we have ceased to love and to serve a supra-mundane Being?

Let who will and can love God and Christ, looking for a celestial crown; let them serve these. But let no one pretend to love or to serve the Infinite, or Evolution, or the idea of Good. It is a farce.

This I take to be the one indispensable, imperishable, truth of Positivism—the one central point round which everything else may be left to group itself. It holds up to us a Power: human, real, demonstrable, loveable—one that we can feel with, and work for, and learn to understand, who provides for us, and whose good we can promote. It shows us something we can love and be proud to serve, something that can stir all our intellectual efforts, reduce them to system, something too that can dignify and justify our best exertions. And this something is the same for our whole nature, and it knits together our whole nature in harmony. It is always *here*, on earth.

The theological believers say 'Have faith and all things shall be added unto you!' So we may say, believe in Humanity (no! it is impossible to disbelieve in Humanity)—but habitually come to

look at Humanity as the converging point of your whole existence, thoughts, feelings, and labour; and all other things may be considered hereafter. It may be that they may be modified, enlarged, reformed. We are not about to claim for the vast intellectual and social programme of A. Comte, any sort of infallibility, or any approach to finality. It will have of course, like all things, to develop with the growth of thought; it may be in parts revised in the progress of knowledge. Conclusions as to historical facts, judgments of men and of ages, scientific theories, logical dogmas, institutions of society, principles of government, details or ideals of social reform, Church, Priesthood, sacraments, and formulas may all, for aught we know, put on new forms or gain new meanings as future ages may require them. That is no affair of ours, and is not a practical matter.

But the one thing that in Positivism represents the Saving Faith is this:—That in the sense of devotion to the vast Human whole, of which each of us is an infinitesimal member, there lies the harmonising Principle that can give unity and force to our mundane nature.

Too much has been made of the deductions and corollaries of the human faith by those who have assailed it, and perhaps to some extent by those who have maintained it. The details, the utopias, the suggestions and illustrations of Comte have been criticised with ridiculous minuteness, and with exaggerated importance. No one of these critics has ventured to dispute the great central Principle of a *human* synthesis for thought and life, the principle that in convergence towards our common Humanity we may at last find complete repose for our efforts—peace within us, peace amongst men.

None of them have ever shaken that great conception—which if it had stood alone would have made Positivism the greatest achievement of modern thought. The critics more or less distinctly or consciously adopt the principle. In fact Mr. Mill, M. Littré, and Mr. Lewes have most emphatically expressed their general adhesion to it. I hardly know what other universal principles there are (outside of theology) unless it may be Evolution and Nirvana.

Let us hold on to this idea, and all other things—doctrines, institutions, practices—will be made clear, or will be hereafter built up on their true foundations.

Now, if there be such a central point of Thought and Life, it follows as a certain deduction that the first of all our duties is to obtain for ourselves, and procure for others, a sound, complete, real education, an education not merely scientific, but moral and emotional, and not merely moral, but formed by practice into habit.

Deeper than all social reforms, before all political institutions, before all forms of government, more vital than any burning question whatever—lies the great want of a true education—an education to make this unity a reality.

The systematic concentration of our human faculties of brain, sympathy, activity, will not come about by itself or be maintained by itself, by talking about Man or by ejaculating Humanity. It will need a constant systematic education: training of mind, of heart, of habit.

But if there is to be a systematic education there must be trained and organised educators.

It would be a delusion, indeed it would be frivolous, to imagine that a really comprehensive and positive Synthesis (a scheme for a oneness of life based on facts) can be maintained by itself without continual, disciplined, organised efforts to sustain it.

A systematic education implies organised teaching; and as the education would be a dry, logical, ineffective thing, if it were limited to intellectual truth alone, so the organised teaching must extend to the moral and emotional nature; must advise, assist, modify the active, practical, and industrial nature as well.

If a systematic education mean more than the imparting of knowledge—and so it surely does—organised teaching must mean more than the lessons of academical professors.

It must mean some appeal to our deepest feelings, some forming of the character, some influence over action and habit.

This then is at bottom what Auguste Comte meant when he spoke of Church and a Priesthood. He used words which have come to be connected with Theology and with arbitrary authority, whilst of course he meant nothing of the kind. But he used words which imply a moral and a religious community, and moral and religious training—simply because he did mean a moral and a religious community, and he did mean a moral and religious training.

The meanings, other than this, which by association have gathered round these words, differ essentially from anything that is dreamed of by Positivism.

If Positivism have real religion, that Religion is uniformly natural, not supernatural; human, not theological; scientific, not imaginary.

‘Religion which was first spontaneous, then inspired, lastly revealed, has now become demonstrated and demonstrable.’

If Positivism have any Priesthood, those priests, so called, will be simply the educators in science: philosophers, physicians, artists, moralists, practical teachers of real and practical things; without wealth, with no State establishment; with no political authority, with no legal monopoly, with no privileges or endowments, no anti-social tradition, no spiritual prestige—with no inspired books, no mystical Church; with no Heaven to promise, no Hell to threaten—with nothing but their knowledge, their usefulness, their high character, their sweetness of nature, to give them any influence whatever.

Why need any man fear such a Church and such a Priesthood—rather let me say such an education, such trained teachers?

It may be that the world is not ripe for the bare idea of an organised teaching, cannot tolerate the experiment of a systematic education at all. But if this be so, the world must as yet bid farewell to the hope that man will ever arrive at a permanent Synthesis at all—at any common centre of action for all sides of our nature and all parts of society.

Some provisional Synthesis men must have, whether they choose to call it Religion, Philosophy, or Truth. Some organised agency to keep that synthesis together they must have; call it Church, Education, Priesthood, Leaders of Thought, or Spirit of the Age.

If the ways and thoughts of modern civilisation reject everything that is not scientific, real, and organic, then the only Synthesis or Central Principle of Life that is left us, is the Devotion of our lives to Humanity. This is the one centre which is perfectly real and intelligible, wholly practical, entirely human, and yet most utterly sympathetic.

Thus only can Feeling be raised to its true place, that of inspiring our whole being.

Thus only will the Intellect be seriously stirred to work with Feeling, and to devote itself to enlighten, guide, and do the work of Feeling.

Thus only will Energy find a truly moral and sympathetic object of work—politics being controlled by morals—politics here meaning Industry as much as Government, so that man's practical activity as a whole may be moralised.

'Life in all its Thoughts as in all its Actions is brought under the inspiring charm of Social Affection.'

An answer that I often hear is this—'Very true, it is a beautiful ideal; but we do not want social affection: we fail to see the charm.' What can be the reply to this? I know but of one reply. 'Your life will be *wasted*, will finally be miserable; the society around you will share your doubts, will go on becoming more discordant till you all do feel it. If you cannot feel the charm of social affection, you will feel the horror of social discord, of utter lawlessness and self-will.'

What has Theology, or any religion, to say to the man who deliberately declares that he prefers vice, self—his lower nature? If the priest says, Hell, the man of vice laughs: and the Priest is now ashamed of saying, Hell. But this cynical avowal is not true. All this is a controversial sophism, a boast, affectation, but it is not fact. The very man who says this is a tender husband, a self-denying father, a true friend, a warm politician, an ardent patriot, a devoted public servant, an excellent citizen. No man's life is a con-

sistent career of selfishness. Nothing can be founded on systematic selfishness.

Let us see of what elements Religion consists, and try how far Humanity affords a base for each of these.

First, of course, Religion implies a belief. We always except the Religion of Nature, or of the Unknowable, or the Religion of the Infinite—which are mere phrases—meaning only that the supposed believer would like to believe something if he could only make up his mind. But all serious Religion implies belief.

The belief of Theology is definite enough, but it is very limited. God made the world and Christ died for it; and it is the duty of man to worship and serve them, preparing for his soul a future of Heaven or of Hell.

Now not only is this belief in continual conflict with reason, but it has nothing whatever to say to the reason itself, throughout the whole vast range of our intellectual interests and achievements.

The creed of Humanity is not merely the belief that Humanity *is*. That is obvious. It is the belief that man's highest function consists in the true understanding of Humanity and perfecting Humanity through sympathy.

Here our whole intellectual nature is supplied with a purpose, and is concentrated on an object. To understand Humanity and its conditions is to understand History, Social Philosophy, Morals, the laws of Mind, the laws of Progress. To understand the indispensable conditions of Humanity is to understand Science, the laws of Life, the laws of Matter, the nature of the Earth on which Man abides. To perfect Humanity is to bring all our knowledge to bear on human life, to utilise science and make knowledge bear fruit for good. Man needs every shred of real knowledge attainable: but he most of all needs it made efficient; co-ordinated and systematised to working harmony. Thus the *Belief* which can alone support a religion of Humanity is science: only, Science grouped around the Science of Man, and all leading up to that—and one thing more—so ordered that it will ennoble the human heart and enrich human life.

Thus Humanity throws across our whole mental range, and every process of thought, a great central creative Principle. It explains Man to himself, explains the world of Nature and his relation to it, explains to him his Duty in the double condition of his own nature and his external surrounding on this planet.

But every Religion that ever was must have something more than Belief. It has some kind of external Devotion: Worship—commemoration—ceremony—thanksgiving.

It is here that the modern sceptic, agnostic, materialist, even the modern Deist, or Theosophist, is most scandalised, most satirical, or most hostile to Positivism. But what is worship? Simply the out-

ward expression, the visible emotion, of Veneration, and of Self-surrender to a Power or a Being that we love and serve.

But no men are without it, or wish to discard it altogether. The outward expression of Veneration, Love, Devotion of Self, is not dead even in our puzzled, divided, shy, material England of to-day, on the dry ashes of the Calvinist Volcano, in the Gospel of Plutonism, and each for himself. It is not extinct even in the most negative and atheistic school. No living men show a deeper sense of Worship—if worship be the visible expression of Reverence and of Self-sacrifice—than some of the maddest communists, materialists, and social democrats. They are for ever making demonstrations of their enthusiastic regard for some public cause—some social ideal. The commemoration of Voltaire is worship, the annual visit to the graves of the slaughtered Communists is worship, the devotion to the Red Flag, or the White Flag, or the Tricolor, is worship. When Atheist, Voltairean, Democratic Paris pours out on All Saints' Day in a mass to the cemeteries, Paris is performing an act of worship, such as Protestant, serious England, with her Established Church and her thousand sects, never knew.

But Worship is a thing far other than public demonstrations in churches or processions. If Worship be the visible or conscious outpouring of our affection, attachment, self-sacrifice, it is about us ever (thanks be to Humanity) in our homes, and in our souls, alone, or in our families, as in great gatherings of men and women. All acts of public homage and respect, all private offerings of friendship and of duty are acts of Worship. All honest rejoicing at a marriage and a birth, all real mourning at a funeral, the visible emotions in the sacred quiet of the household, are acts of Worship, if only they are real, unselfish, spontaneous. The young mother as she hangs breathless to watch her child asleep, the married pair as they sit side by side watching their children as they blossom into life, the daughter at the grave of her mother, the mother weeping over the letters of her son, two friends who rest true to each other, though duty, space, or death separate them, every man who in silence and in purity of heart resolves that somebody or something shall be the better for him ere he die, every honest man who throws his heart into his work—all of these are fulfilling an irresistible act of Worship.

Away, then, with the peevish paradox of pedants and cynics that mankind has outgrown Worship. Man never was more prone to Worship, for he worships no longer in terror, ignorance, self-interest. He worships all that he finds of Good in the world; he worships freely, and he worships thoughtfully, wisely, and sweetly.

And why are we to discard this irrepressible appeal to Emotion? If human life is to be warmed and guided by a high purpose and a noble affection, we must cultivate that affection, consciously appeal to it, stimulate it, give it free play, frankly and heartily show our

sense of the beauty of it, without shame and without stint. Affection, self-devotion, social duty of all kinds, are powerfully kindled by the very act of expression. In matters of the heart the expression is the act. We love most when we show love. We grow nobler by acknowledging every real and noble resolve. We come closer to one another when we vow to stand close for ever. We surrender ourselves most purely when we are uttering our sense of adoration. Emotion, like every sound feeling, grows as we give it play. 'We tire of acting,' says Auguste Comte; 'we tire even of thinking; we never tire of loving.'

What an infinite field for Worship is there opened in the Religion of Humanity! There is the expression of our Reverence, attachment and Devotion to the onward Progress of our race, itself perpetually stimulating us to add something to its sum of good; there is the commemoration of every worthy life, the continuation of the memory of the great dead, the acknowledgment of all the unceasing Providence it provides us.

But Worship in our faith is not limited to this. Our duty to our great Western Commonwealth of nations, to our own country, to our city, to our immediate community, to our families, to those dearest and closest, our responsibility for those dependent on us, on those who serve us, on the poor around us, on all whom we can help, every quality of civic, or domestic, or personal duty, the spirit of loyalty, chivalry, of protection, of submission, of discipline, of brotherliness, of courtesy, of graciousness, every quality of man, every serious act of our public or private lives,—may alike be ennobled and inspired, when deepened by the expression of a true and pure Emotion.

I say nothing of all those solemn and public acts of expression by which Auguste Comte has proposed to celebrate the long past, the great Power, the high hopes of Humanity, a series of public commemorations going through each great epoch of civilisation.

I say nothing now of those ceremonies by which he sought to clothe every civic and domestic act with the outward and visible mark of a great social character. I say nothing of those ceremonies (which he called *sacraments*), by which he sought to stamp on the personal life of each of us the social destiny that awaits us.

I say nothing of all of these. They remain for the Future to work out. They might be to many a difficulty. They may find some further development. I insist on none of these, for they are at most but on trial, in their germ.

All that I do insist upon is this—that a direct and visible appeal to our sense of Duty is as natural now as it was when the Athenians at Salamis were heard by the Persian host chanting the songs of the Gods before the greatest battle of the world, or when French Democrats went smiling to death singing the Marseillaise.

Man cannot forego the expression of noble feeling, if he is to have noble feeling at all.

* And in the History of Man, in the life of Man, in the duties and relations of man to man, we shall find an inexhaustible field for the expression of every note in the gamut of human feeling.

Thought and Feeling are not enough. We need Practice—Action. Hence the elements of Religion are not only Belief, that is, an intellectual scheme, and Worship, or an appeal to the highest Feeling, but Discipline (or Scheme of Life).

Here, again, in active life the central point of Humanity offers us a dominant Principle. Theology with its ideal Heaven and unearthly rewards always draws off its devotees from active life, treats it as a stumbling-block to godliness, has really nothing to say to it, except to hope that it will be saintly. What more have the Metaphysics of the Universum or the Infinite to say to active life? How is the Unknowable, or Infinity, or the Universal Mind, to be made the basis of practical energy?

Theology and Metaphysics renounce the domain of active life, as a hermit might shun a battle.

The only practical Gospel which now directs active life in the retreat of Theology and of Metaphysics from that which is the real end of Man's existence—the only Practical Gospel now current is the so-called Economic Gospel of Each for Himself, and the World coming right at last by every one pursuing his personal interest.

Between the fantastic unworldliness of Theology, and the cynical worldliness of mere Plutonism, stands Positivism with its claim to base man's active existence on an unselfish co-operation in the practical welfare of Humanity—with no extravagant self-renunciation, but as the natural and healthy end of human activity, under the impulse of social sympathy, as in the long run the best for us all, and the truest source of happiness. This is, in fact, the principle of 'The greatest happiness of the greatest number'—utilitarian in effect, though not utilitarian in motive, but social, unselfish, benevolent.

If it be said that this is an impossible ideal—a Utopian standard of duty—how much less Utopian and alien to human instincts is it than the Theological crown of glory!

If it be said that it is an appeal from the more violent selfish instincts to the less potent unselfish duties—what religion that ever deserved the name did not seek to curb the selfish instincts by invoking the superior charm and permanence of the nobler elements of the human spirit?

The practical, sensible, free service of Humanity by intelligent work towards the general well-being of the Race stands between the artificial dreaming of Theology and the bestial self-seeking of Plutonism, without asceticism, without unreality, without vulgarity—working happily and naturally, devoted to Industry but not

exaggerating Industry, seeking material results, but only as the stepping-stone to moral results, dealing with the world like producers, citizens, politicians, but acting so that all work shall conduce to Beauty, Wisdom, Goodness.

I put this question to all who from any point of view believe that human life is in need of mending. Is anything (in this age of knowledge and civilisation) at all worth trying unless it can assert its power over the Intellectual World, the Moral World, and the Practical World?

Does any one but a professing Christian believe that Theology, in any one of its shifting forms, really asserts its power alike over all three?

Is there anything that does assert it, or can assert it—bring to this test, Pantheism, or Atheism, Evolution, the Unknowable—is there anything that stands the test of all three but the Principle of referring all to the Humanity that is, that has been, that is to be?

This idea, we may say, is in the air, about us everywhere, and is ever growing up unconsciously in men's minds. Still, it does not follow but that it will meet with endless objections. But what are objections? and why need we expect to satisfy them? It is the age of objections, and of objectors: a large portion of the cultured classes think the true function of the human brain is to manufacture objections. What is called 'literature' and 'criticism' is for the most part the trade of supplying the public with objections, just as the business of the 'Opposition' in Parliament is always to show that the Government is wrong, and of the counsel on the other side always to show that his 'learned friend' has no case. Such is the fertility of the enstatic genius that the trade flourishes in the Houses, in the Courts, in letters. A critic would, indeed, be a tyro if he could not find a hundred 'objections' to every religion and every philosophy from Moses to the Latter-day Saints.

But men who mean to do anything do not occupy themselves largely in satisfying objections, or the still more hopeless task of satisfying objectors. Ideas, schemes, institutions, slowly win their way upon the world by virtue of their power to assimilate mental and moral forces, and their general fitness for a given situation. In how small a degree do they succeed by logical triumphs! Without pretending any comparison which many would resent, one may say this: Christianity would have made slow way, if it had waited till it had an answer to all the philosophers; or Protestantism, if it had waited till it had satisfied the objections of its Catholic critics. Nor would what is vaguely called Liberalism or Progress have progressed very far, if it were bound to silence its opponents, those who were so by conviction, and those who were so by profession. The human faith, like every faith, will win its way by affirmations and proofs, not by rejoinders and surrebutters.

This would still be so, if the human faith were something new ; but it is not new. Shouts of laughter are raised at the very idea of a New Religion. Let us grant freely that there is something laughable in a new Religion, though Moses, Christ, and Mahomet did not think the idea a laughing matter. Sober moderns, as we all now profess to be, will, however, agree that there is something at least hugely paradoxical about the idea of a really new religion. The human faith is in truth the old faith ; it is the oldest of all religions ; it brings the newer phases of religion into relations with the older. There is nothing really new in the Religion of Humanity except the formal and systematic embodiment of all those yearnings of heart and imaginative visions of the world which formed the inner life of so many forms of tentative religion. Moses, St. Paul, Mahomet, and Luther now meant, as we can show, the same essential thing in a vague mystical way—so too did Bouddha and Confucius—they all sought that great conception which should explain to Man himself and the World around him, the law on which both rested, so that thereby Man, finding it, should have peace, and rise to the purity and might of his full nature. And they all found peace, found purity and might, for a time in a limited degree, and they called their great key to the infinite, Jehovah, Islam, the Bible, Nirvana, the Right Rule.

All kinds of religion have sought these two things. (1) the truth of man's relation to the Universe. (2) the true source and canon of man's duty. All sorts of incomplete, poetical, or mystical answers have been given to these two questions. Positivism now simply says—(1) The true relation of Man to the Universe is the relation proved by Science ; (2) the source and canon of man's duty is to be found in a true and full knowledge of human nature. How can any one call this new ? Every kind of religion has tried to give the answers in a partial way, in imaginative, anthropomorphic, or fanciful impersonations. They all, says Positivism, had their strong points and should be utilised, provided they be reduced to science, that is, to systematised common sense, and be made mutually consistent.

What has happened in the case not of every new Religion (there is no such thing possible), but of every new conception of Religion, is this : that spiritual men, struck with some crying evil or void in the old conception, have ardently pressed on the society of their time a new, or purer, or larger conception. In so doing, they have often neglected, sometimes have even purposely neglected, the strong side of the old conception. All new systems or new readings of old systems conquer, when they succeed, by virtue of some great want that they fill, not by satisfying the subtlest doubt in every ingenious mind. Polytheism afforded an inexhaustible field for the fancy and the energy of ancient civic life. Christianity, burning to restore to a corrupt and cruel age the sense of purity, humility, and humanity, flung aside beauty, joy, freedom, patriotism, philosophy, and ~~manly~~ culture,

in order to cast itself with passionate contrition before an ascetic and terrible image of Man and God. The Cross, Sin, Death, Damnation came into the world, doing great things, crushing out great things. Mahomet, again, trampled on the gross hagiology of the Greek Church, and called his warriors to rally round their one God and His immutable Will.

All systems of religion have insisted powerfully on some great element of spiritual life, and have been systems of religion because they did so. They were usually indifferent, contemptuous, or hostile to the great elements of their predecessors. The great Polytheists repudiated the confusion and grossness of Fetichism; the Monotheists pointed with shame and scorn to all that had been sacrificed when Venus was made a goddess, and Mars, Mithras, and Apis were jumbled into one indiscriminate pantheon; still more did the Reformers rave against all the vices of Mariolatry and Hagiology, and what had come out of a celibate priesthood and a powerful hierarchy.

The good sense of mankind in the long run throws off these one-sided efforts to make religion first all energy and versatility; then all ecstasy and self-control; then all submission and austerity; and, finally, all mysticism and spiritual receptivity.

It is inevitable that, each time a stronger and more rational conception of religion begins to prevail, the devotees and the advocates of the old conception should cry out that they are being robbed of the particular feature of religion which the old conception represented. The old conception invariably in course of time had come to exaggerate and even caricature its special element. Nowadays deep and tender souls cry out 'where else can you find that intense force to wring and curb the heart which we have in the image of an all-seeing God in whose eyes the most secret sin, the faintest gust of passion, is an offence to be expiated only by the blood of his own Son?' No doubt it is a tremendous force and has had infinite command over human passion. But the question is whether the idea is true, consistent with the rest of man's knowledge, and on the whole an adequate explanation of human life. The question is whether people still continue to believe it; whether too much is not sacrificed in trying to get them to believe it. If the world still believes this explanation, we shall hear little of Positivism. If the world has ceased to believe it, it is useless to tell Positivists that they are without this terrific engine of morality. Positivists reply that the terrific engine having now ceased to work, it is best to fall back on such human and rational motives of social duty as moral science and history suggest.

Suppose the United Kingdom Temperance Alliance were to preach that every glass of ardent spirits had the effect of oxalic acid and would burn up the vitals of the drinker in ten minutes: suppose that temperance orators had actually persuaded a very ignorant population that this was true. The people at last find them out and take again

to drink. A more sober body of temperance advocates appeal to them, in the name of moral and social duty. Whereupon the advocates of the oxalic acid theory cry out—‘The most potent of all the temperance arguments is being abandoned!’ Potent, no doubt, so long as it is believed in, and provided it be true. It is not difficult to get potent arguments either for an agitation or for a religion, if you feel at liberty to resort to your invention for your moral and religious sanctions.

So too with the whole apparatus of ecstatic bliss, endless torment, seraphic rejoining with loved ones, the eternal recompense for earthly pain, the everlasting communing of congenial souls, the heavenly contemplation of infinite goodness—all these have been the force of Christianity, the force of Catholicism, the force of Protestantism. How often has the overburdened spirit felt peace amid agony and bereavement: how often have the dying lips smiled in peace: what trust and calm have beamed in the eyes of the weakest, the most afflicted, the most forsaken! We know it all. We too have felt all these things. We are not cynics, swinishly deaf to the spiritual voices. Why ask us if we have any such things in our faith; if we can give these seraphic raptures, these superhuman joys and hopes?

Certainly not. It is quite possible that no rational faith whatever has any exact equivalent to these ecstasies, or can work these miracles in subduing sense, and galvanising certain chords of emotion. Perhaps not! But the question again is, are they true, are they real, or are they artificial? Because if they are, if men once begin to suspect that, after all, these joys are pious hopes, pious fancies, pious frauds, it will go ill with the believers as well as with the preachers.

It is idle, therefore, now to cry out that we are robbing men of this exquisite bliss, and hope, and trust. There is no trust, no bliss, or hope in it; if men come (they know not how) to doubt if it be true—rather there is an awful abyss and void. In these days the business before the orthodox is not to show how sublime or ecstatic these hopes are (if they be real)—but whether or not they are real. This is work enough for the present.

It is beside the question, therefore, to expatiate, as do curates and the semi-theological journals, on the infinite sublimity or pathos of the current gospels and creeds. Do not expatiate on their beauty; but restore us our trust in their credibility and reality. You might as well enlarge on the superior advantages of immortality here on earth, and argue that therefore it is materialism to believe in death at all. Or you might call on us to be as the Angels are, and to pass like Seraphim into serener worlds than this. The sublimity of a conception is no proof of its reality; gives us no guarantee that it is not a dream—rather the contrary. Children long to be angels, fairies, or stars. Men desire to be the best that mortal men on this planet can become.

The only question for serious instructed men in the Nineteenth Century is this : what, with all the lights of modern science, history, and philosophy, is the soundest and completest view to take of Man's place in the world, and Man's duty to himself and to others? It is quite possible that the answer may not include the ecstatic and gorgeous visions of the Gospel, but it will include a vast deal that the Gospel shuts out, and its practical effect on the entire scope of human life may be far more equable and complete.

Some Christian devotees seem in a chronic state of cataleptic predisposition. Civilisation would come to an end, or would return to the condition of the twelfth century, if this artificial condition of spiritual tension were common to the busy millions on the earth. Real religion is not to be measured by the hysterical sensibilities of a few selected men and women, who have leisure to nurse their emotions, who know very little of the world and nothing, it may be, of history. Can it be that, for all time, and for the whole human race, the conditions of Religion must be squared to the visions which the author of the 'Imitation' saw in his cell, and the author of 'Pilgrim's Progress' saw in his prison? If we take a broad view of the spiritual manifestations of the whole human race, we shall find that this particular type of soul is one amongst many, one of the most beautiful, one of the most memorable, but still one highly artificial and strung upon a single chord. The heroism and the graces of the ancient world were not drawn from this type; nor was the imposing strength of the Eastern religions; nor are the rich and splendid resources of modern civilisation. The human faith will make no attempt to talk in the language of monks and puritans; it will talk to men in the language of men.

We often hear that there is much uncertainty as to what Humanity is, and still more as to what its past history has been. There may be some margin of uncertainty as to what the English people is, and a greater as to what has been the history of the English people. But both ideas are amply sufficient for the feeling of patriotism and the work of politics. Humanity is a general term for a reality that can only be varied within very moderate limits, and the general course of civilisation is sufficiently clear for practical purposes. The objection to the vagueness of humanity comes but strangely from the mouths of theologians who interpret the being of the Godhead and the nature of Christ in infinite modes, all of them being professedly *a priori* hypotheses. Whatever Humanity may be, or its history may have been, it appeals exclusively to scientific proof and recorded facts. Argument and difference are possible as to the exact value of those facts, as about the solar system, or spontaneous generation. But the whole discussion from beginning to end is in the field of science; and its methods are rational and experimental.

Those who in the main adopt the scheme of Auguste Comte will think of Humanity and its Past as he does, as explained by the whole

course of positive Sociology. But the practical efficacy of the Human Synthesis will not need to wait for this. It is exerting already its influence over masses of men, who conceive of it loosely and feebly perhaps, who are almost blind to its true continuity, but who are able to feel its reality and dominant control. Since it is the real solution of the problems which have lain at the root of so many types of religion, its property is to appear by degrees through the dissolving fragments of other creeds. For a century at least, since the later half of the last century, it has been the real force that has stimulated and disciplined society. As the orthodoxies fail men and the older Churches and societies give way, men fall back instinctively and unconsciously on Humanity, for guidance, for help, for discipline. Humanity has no need to be brought down or revealed to men. It is there amongst them, as it has long been, working and shaping them. It needs only to become familiar and articulate.

What a picture of human life may we not see, as in a vision, under the influence of this vivifying principle!

Underneath all lies the indispensable institution of a universal Education—an education for all, free, open, without conditions, an education which may put the capable artisan on an intellectual level with any other citizen, an education continued long after the childhood or boyhood, until the maturity of manhood, which is now only thought the privilege of the rich. An Education, universal in another sense, that it will be a real training in science, not a mechanical exercise in language, an Education leading up to a practical knowledge of man's history and his social and moral nature.

Whence is such an Education to come, it is said? Whence, but from the sense of social duty, and of social necessity in those who hold the material and intellectual resources of society, the rich and the learned? If the zeal of all the social reformers, the conscience and public spirit of all the patriotic citizens, the patience of the man of science and the philosopher, the enthusiasm of the missionary, the evangelising spirit of the Christian, all pulled one way, and converged, as they now diverge and counteract each other, what would not result? Now 10,000 pulpits are fulminating against 10,000 newspapers, reviews, and lectures, and the fervour of the socialist reformer is quenched in the cold logic of the anti-social economist, and the crude sense of the practical statesman. Find them a common doctrine, fuse science, religion, socialism, economy, progress, conservatism, in one purpose, and the force of the educating power (now frittered away in internecine combat) would be beyond the reach of thought.

Out of such an educating body (call them philosophers, men of science, lecturers, preachers, priests, or thinkers) would rise up necessarily a spiritual, moralising force. The intellectual activity of a world based on the ever present Image of Humanity, could not rest in Material Science. Its whole intellectual system would converge

towards the focus of Man. The Science of Human Nature, as the noblest part of Science, would be the Crown and End of Science; and the noblest faculty of Man would be the subject of the Science of Human Nature. 'Men of Science' would not mean men who cut up frogs, and resolve *nebulae* into new star worlds; but it would primarily mean moralists, social philosophers, historians. Science, philosophy, literature, law, would not be fields for accumulating a fortune, or winning some personal prize: they would be the great functions on which society itself depends.

Nor would this education be an intellectual one alone. It would be a training of the moral nature, of the feelings, of the heart. Women would be the great educators and moral regenerators—none being doomed to struggle in an idle competition in physical force with men, they would form the spirit of the young, become the moral providence of the home, and the moral inspirers of society—presenting in public and in private life the highest standard of spiritual truth. And life in public and private would be continually renewed by a set of institutions and practices that recalled to us its meaning and referred it to its higher purpose.

Enlightened by a systematic and scientific philosophy, moralised and dignified by a constant appeal to duty, man's active life would be set free to devote all its resources to the amelioration of our human lot. Industry would be moderated, inspired, and moralised, until it purged itself of the detestable aim of piling up fortunes and securing personal enjoyments, and set itself to raise the condition of the workers themselves—capital being held in trust as the public instrument of the community, captains of industry feeling themselves as much bound to watch over the welfare of their soldiers, as are captains of armies in the field. The business of the rich would be to use wealth in the noble spirit of social advancement that the best philosophers have shown in the use of their knowledge, and the best rulers have shown in the use of their power. The incalculable resources of modern civilisation and the boundless ingenuity of modern invention would all be resolutely concentrated, not in the task of scrambling for wealth over the bodies and souls of the creators of wealth, but in an intelligent resolve to mitigate the lot of the toiling masses, and to provide against the consequences of social disorder. A few generations would suffice to make the world forget (as if it were the dark ages) this sordid Battle of Pelf (with its self-help and survival of the unfittest) in which we live, until Industry itself passed by an almost unconscious transition into the mere cultivation of Art and Beauty, and work was concentrated in the expression of pure and noble Feeling. •

In Humanity human life meets and rests at last. Science and Philosophy by it become human, moral, co-ordinated. Devotion becomes rational and practical. Art becomes religious, social, crea-

tive. Industry becomes beneficent, unselfish, ennobling. Politics become a public duty, not an ignoble game. Education becomes a rational preparation for a true life. Religion becomes the bond of spirits within, and of multitudes without. The People enter upon their true Sovereignty, for their well-being is the grand object and care of society. Women at last receive their due place, for theirs is the largest part in the moral and spiritual guidance of their age. The Past is summed up and expressed in the Present, and the two become the natural parent of the Future. And so the whole human race slowly after centuries puts off the habit of War, as it has put off the habit of slavery, and becomes conscious of the vast Brotherhood whose mission is to people and to improve this Planet.

FREDERIC HARRISON.

SMOKE PREVENTION.

It is now two hundred and twenty years since John Evelyn called attention to the evils of the smoke of London. In 1661 he published a tractate, with the title: *Fumifugium, or, the inconvenience of the Air and smoke of London dissipated, together with some remedies humbly proposed by J. E. Esq.* It bears on the title-page a motto from Lucretius:

Carbonumque gravis vis, atque odor insinuat
Quam facile in cerebrum!

—a truth which all who have to work with their brains now in London will have no difficulty in acknowledging. The book is dedicated to the king, as a lover of noble buildings, gardens, pictures, and all royal magnificence, and his Majesty is appealed to with confidence as one who must needs desire to be freed from the prodigious annoyance, then only beginning seriously to invade the metropolis. But Charles the Second loved other things more than the objects of fine taste, on behalf of which the author of *Sylva* appealed to him, nor was public opinion then ripe for listening to wise counsels and solemn warnings on such a matter. In vain was it pointed out how the pernicious nuisance could be reformed, and how the whole city, with its great natural advantages, might be made one of the sweetest and most delicious habitations in the world. At that time London had extended but little beyond the boundaries of the City proper, the nobility still dwelt in it, or in the Strand, and there were abundant open spaces about their houses; yet Evelyn complains that the gardens would no longer bear fruit, giving as the reason for this the increase of coal-smoke, and he mentions orchards in Barbican and along the river, which were observed to have a good crop the year in which Newcastle was besieged (1644), because but a small quantity of coals was brought to London that year. He calls the smoke one of the foulest inconveniences and reproaches that can possibly befall so noble and otherwise incomparable a city, and claims that it should be relieved from what renders it less healthy and more offensive, and which darkens and eclipses all its good attributes; and this is nothing else but ‘that hellish and dismal cloud of sea-coal.’

Evelyn enumerates among the greatest offenders in causing

smoke, bakehouses, breweries, together with the places in which their trades, requiring fires or furnaces, are carried on, and even specifies a lime-kiln on the Thames in the heart of London. His proposed remedies, it must be confessed, were not very practical, and mainly consisted in recommending the use of wood instead of coal as fuel, and in removing the chief offensive trades to a short distance from London.

What was bad two hundred years ago has become enormously worse in our own times. The area of London has increased to something like one hundred square miles, its inhabitants may be estimated at four millions, and the number of chimneys emitting smoke at probably three or four millions, consuming a vast quantity of coals annually, of which a fourth part is wasted in the shape of smoke. It is certain also that, with modern notions of comfort and desire of greater warmth, more fuel is now burnt in proportion to the number of chimneys and inhabitants than was formerly the case.

It may seem almost superfluous and unnecessary to remind any dweller in, or visitor to London of the manifold evils due to the presence of smoke as it now exists in the metropolis. We see it at its very worst when combined with actual fog in that unholy and unwholesome alliance, so well described by the President of the Royal Society when speaking at the public meeting held at the Mansion House early in last January. But it is always with us, around us, or above us, a constant 'smoke-curse,' spreading like a baleful pall of darkness across the fair face of heaven, as described in a letter from Sir Frederick Leighton, President of the Royal Academy, which was read upon the same occasion. Even when the lower atmosphere is comparatively clear, and can be breathed without difficulty, the pervading obscurity is felt, and there is the incessant deposit of unconsumed particles of fuel, either in the shape of flakes of falling soot, or in a more minutely divided, but yet more mischievous and insidious form of attack upon all that is most precious to us.

Considerations of life and health must of course take precedence of all others; and here we find, from statistics which cannot be denied or disputed, the fearful havoc made by London fogs upon the well-being of the community.

The increase of mortality during the fogs which, more or less, were prevalent in London from November 1879 to February 1880, has been discussed by Dr. Arthur Mitchell, and the results published in the Journal of the Scottish Meteorological Society—and it must never be lost sight of, in dwelling upon them, that the mischief done is not due to the fog alone, which outside of a smoke-laden atmosphere might be innocuous—and that whenever in such accounts we encounter the word fog, it really means fog *plus* smoke. The increase in the death-rate during this murky and dismal period was indeed frightful. The mortality in the seven weeks ending on the 21st of

February 1880, as taken from the Registrar-General's reports, shows an addition of many thousands to the average and normal rate of death. Sufferers from asthma were the chief victims, and in their case the mortality increased to 220 per cent. above the average, during the week of the most oppressive fogs. The deaths from bronchitis rose at one time to a total which was 331 per cent. above the average. The number of fatal cases in pneumonia, pleurisy, and other lung diseases was largely added to ; and, as may be easily understood, the mischief did not cease with the disappearance of the fogs, but frequently must have remained with greater or less malignity, ending in early death, or in constitutions permanently enfeebled and deteriorated. The rise in the number of fatal cases of whooping-cough was also remarkably great. Dr. Mitchell's paper received able notice in *Nature* in December last (from which the above figures are taken), a periodical which, as becomes its high scientific reputation, has sustained a prominent and most useful part in the campaign now being carried on—in the combat between suffering humanity on the one hand, and the destroying smoke-demon on the other.

Nor must other phases of illness and discomfort, although falling short of mortal disease, be forgotten. There is the cold which cannot be got rid of ; the tiresome cough ; the constant headache, depression of spirits, and unfitness for work, from which few are so fortunate as to escape during a time of fog—that is to say, in London, of fog and smoke. It seems needless to pass in review other great and unfortunately too familiar forms of evil engendered by fog. The interruption of traffic in the streets, with all its concomitant dangers to life and limb and property ; the total stoppage or interruption of many kinds of business and employment ; the facilities given to plunder, either by stealth or violence, are only too obvious.

The physician cannot be summoned to aid the suffering patient, whose state may have been rendered more critical by a deadly fog ; or if summoned, is unable to reach the place where his services are to be rendered. Less serious perplexities arise when the invited guest must perforce remain for the night in the house of the entertainer, from which the universal darkness prevents departure ; or when the members of a club have to use such suddenly improvised accommodation as can be provided for them under similar circumstances.

Turning to the region of art, the calamities and evils of a smoke-laden atmosphere are indeed serious and manifold. In time of actual fog the painter cannot see to paint, nor is the lover of pictures able to see them. The life of a painter and amateur of his art in London during the winter is one of patience, trials, and constant disappointment. At all times valuable pictures in London require such protection as is not needed elsewhere. The responsible custodians of public picture galleries, as well as private owners, are compelled to resort to the expedient of covering their most treasured canvases

with glass, which is equivalent to destroying a large proportion of the advantage and pleasure to be gained by looking at them, but is a measure of absolute necessity if succeeding generations are to inherit our present possessions in a state of fair preservation.

The buildings of London are blackened, and the very stones with which they are faced are decomposed, by the erosive and destructive qualities of some of the ingredients of coal-smoke, and other products of combustion. The finest architectural effects are thus spoiled, as may be seen notably in St. Paul's Cathedral and the palace of Westminster. The unhappy statues in the open air are melancholy objects, enveloped in a black and furry coating of deposited soot. All objects of art are exposed to constant injury and deterioration. Books which in the library of a country house would retain the freshness of a new binding for almost a lifetime, lose it in London in almost as many weeks as it would take years to destroy it if beyond the reach of the arch-destroyer.

The artists of the dramatic stage, the opera, and the concert-room, and all who have to exercise their voices in public, suffer exceedingly in times of fog, as do the audiences, whose enjoyment is marred by the enforced incapacity of the performers to gratify them according to their wont, when the choking atmosphere interferes with their best exertions.

Last, but not as the least evil, must be mentioned the baleful effect of smoke upon the parks and gardens of London, and on all vegetation exposed to its influence. A letter from the Rev. Septimus Hansard, rector of Bethnal Green, addressed to the joint Fog and Smoke Abatement Committee of the National Health and Kyrle Societies, and read at one of their meetings in last December, explains very clearly the extent of this mischief, but also happily gives good hope of a remedy, if only it is sought for with patience and perseverance. Sixteen years ago, when Mr. Hansard took possession of this rectory, he was told that not a blade of grass would live upon his lawn, and he was laughed at for thinking of growing flowers. Altogether he had to deal with nearly four acres of open ground, but surrounded by houses, and in close proximity to eight manufacturing chimneys, all of low elevation. He availed himself of the Smoke Nuisance Act, and enlisted the sympathy of his poorer neighbours to assist him, and especially asthmatic invalids, and women who had clothes to put out to dry, and other individual sufferers. By steady continuance in this course the result is, that Mr. Hansard now has a lawn fit to play croquet or lawn-tennis upon, for which he challenges comparison with any lawn in the most distant suburbs of London. He can now grow no less than thirty-nine annuals; lilies of various kinds flourish with him, and gardeners will not fail to appreciate the improvement obtained, upon learning that Mr. Hansard can now boast of his specimens of asphodel, his Greek acanthus,

his Indian pinks, and his *Phlox Drummondii*. The rector of Bethnal Green points out that what has been done in one parish can be done in another, and that the police, if duly kept acquainted with infringement of the law, which they cannot be expected in every case to notice for themselves, are always willing to do their duty. His experience further enables Mr. Hansard to say that the owners of offending chimneys are, for the most part, ready to do the right thing when due attention is called to them. That it is clearly for their pecuniary interest to consume the fuel which is so largely and absolutely wasted, and thrown away in the shape of smoke, needs no demonstration. Every particle of coal which is driven off as smoke, and is not burnt in the furnace or fireplace as flame, is so much good combustible matter lost to the person who has paid for it, and all the labour and time occupied in putting it into the furnace, or on to the fire, is just so much labour and time altogether lost and rendered unproductive.

Having now gone over the various counts of a most formidable indictment for nuisance, it is certainly strange to have to remark that evils of such magnitude and persistence as those arising from London smoke should have been allowed to continue with so little effort made to check them. It is true that legislation has not been wholly neglected in the matter. In 1847, a general Town Regulation Act contained a provision for factories to consume their own smoke. The Act for smoke abatement passed in 1853, and extended in 1856, has done something for the relief of the metropolis. The Sanitary Act of 1866 prohibits black smoke issuing from chimneys in such quantity as to be a nuisance. Nor were similar prohibitions omitted from the Public Health Acts for Scotland, England, and Ireland, passed respectively in 1867, 1875, and 1878. But chimneys of private dwelling-houses are excepted from the operation of all these statutes.

When Lord Palmerston was at the Home Office, he applied his vigorous common sense to the due enforcement of the earlier acts, which, however, as has just been mentioned, applied only to manufacturing fires and furnaces. For many years past indifference or misplaced toleration has led to considerable neglect in using the legal powers which exist to prevent smoke. A long interval was allowed to elapse during which little or no action was taken, and with the growth of the metropolis the smoke has also grown, and become the monstrous incubus pressing upon it, against which a suffering population has for so long been almost helpless.

Recently, however, a combined effort has been made towards endeavouring to obtain a better state of things. The National Health Society, which made its seventh annual report in 1880, has taken the matter up, and, in conjunction with the more recently formed Kyrle Society, is now organising a movement from which

much may be expected. The objects of the first-named society, as its name imports, are to promote the means of averting preventible disease, and to diffuse the knowledge essential for healthy life in the community. Under its auspices lectures have been given on such subjects as House Architecture, Workmen's Homes, Food, Cookery, Fresh Air, Elementary Physiology, and other cognate matters. The smoke prevention question seems to fall strictly within the scope of this society's operations, and it is allied in its present enterprise with the Kyrle Society, whose general intentions are of a more æsthetic character; but to which this question also properly belongs in its efforts to render more happy the existence of the people at large, to assist in any work which will tend to procure for them greater enjoyment of the open spaces of London, to render easier the cultivation of flowers in private gardens and windows, and to preserve works of art from premature and avoidable destruction.

A joint committee of the two societies has been appointed, and is actively at work. The co-operation of the authorities of the Science and Art Department at South Kensington has been secured, and arrangements have been made for an exhibition to take place in this year, to advance the cause of economy of fuel and bright skies, against the predominance of waste and gloom. The resources of South Kensington for such a purpose are unrivalled for exhibiting apparatus, and for conducting experiments upon fuel, and contrivances for its most beneficial consumption. Improved fire-grates, furnaces, kitcheners, cooking and warming apparatus of all kinds for avoiding smoke, or burning smokeless coal, will be collected and experimented upon; so also will be brought together and practically examined different varieties of coal and other fuels. Experiments will also be invited and encouraged upon a large scale at the premises of proprietors of furnaces and factories who will permit their being made; and all this will be conducted under the direction of a skilled committee of experts. The results to be hoped for and expected will be, for the future, a more scientific and economical employment of coal; improvements in the domestic fireplace; a more complete knowledge of the various available kinds of coal, and their suitability for different purposes; practical suggestions for the amendment or extension of the existing Acts for the regulation of smoke-producing furnaces, &c.; and reports upon the use of gas as a means of supplying heat, and generally to test inventions for the avoidance of smoke, and the economical use of all kinds of fuel. Funds are wanted to complete the amount necessary to defray the expenses of the exhibition and the experiments mentioned. Subscriptions have already been received, and further contributions may be paid to the secretary or treasurer of the Fog and Smoke Abatement Committee, at No. 44 Berners Street, Oxford Street, London.

It is not intended in this place to pronounce any opinion upon

the vast number of ingenious contrivances invented and in progress of invention for the prevention of smoke in trade and manufacturing furnaces. This is so for two reasons: one, because the vast volume of London smoke now escapes from domestic fireplaces; the other, because it is clear that the existing Smoke Prevention Acts, if properly worked, together with some future possible extension of their provisions, may be made almost entirely to cure the existing evil so far as they can be made to bear upon it. The main principle of all inventions for smoke-consuming furnaces is the same—namely, to keep the interior of the furnace as hot as possible, and secured from unnecessary intrusion of cold air, and to insure a gradual supply of fuel; or, in other words, to provide good mechanical and automatic stoking. But all require more or less personal attention, and it is rather to the want of knowledge and diligence on the part of attendants, than to any want of power to consume smoke in the various inventions, that their frequent failure must be attributed. Ignorance and indolence in using them lead to the same mischief as they do when human attention alone has to be entirely relied on in stoking. The same caution has to be observed in both cases—that is, not to introduce more fuel at a time than can be at once, or almost at once, made to burst into flame, and so that it shall not continue to give out black smoke for more than a few moments. In the instances where the attention of the owner is sharply called to the neglect of the persons employed by him, through a police summons under the Smoke Prevention Act, it generally turns out that the apparatus is not in fault, and it is thereupon made to do its duty.

In attempting to deal with the domestic fireplace many things have to be carefully recollected. If an Englishman's house is his castle, the domestic fireplace is the keep of the castle, the very centre and citadel of the stronghold. If any way could be devised of improving the grates of our living-rooms, and the ranges of our kitchens, by anything at all approaching to coercive legislation, the matter would be one of great difficulty for the Government which might be so bold as to undertake it. At present, persuasion, example, and an appeal to motives of self-interest seem to be the only methods open to adoption; but a good deal may fairly be expected by endeavours made in these directions. Few people would be inclined to give up the habitual open fireplace, with its cheerful blaze and good ventilating powers. It has many charms and advantages, and after all that can be said in favour of other modes of warming a room, the radiant heat from an open fire has merits with which nothing else can compete when all things are taken into consideration. Certainly it is wasteful of fuel, expensive, and makes a great deal of dirt; but we cling to it, and love it all the same. No sudden or immediate change can be expected; there is no heroic remedy to be recommended or administered, but patient insistence on the benefits to be gained

in health, comfort, and pocket may gradually do much, if not everything, to remove the reproach of the misfortune which now weighs upon the capital of England.

The exhibition at South Kensington, promoted by the National Health and Kyrle Societies, will probably be the means of suggesting some improvements upon the best existing domestic fireplaces, and in the fuel to be burned in them, and the mode of using it. But there are now many excellent and inexpensive kinds of fireplace which can be procured with ease, and many old fireplaces admit of alteration by lining them with fire-brick, for example, or otherwise. Indeed, there has been great progress in attention to the principles which should guide the construction of a good fireplace during the last twenty or thirty years. Well-built houses are now pretty certain to contain such ; and even in the inferior class of dwellings the modern fireplaces are far better than they formerly were.

It is now eighty years since Count Rumford, the founder of the Royal Institution, and to whom the science of heat owes so much, first began to improve the domestic fireplace, and the practical directions he gave have since been largely followed. To him is due the contraction of the opening of the chimney immediately above the fireplace, the abolition of the hobs, and the setting of the sides of the opening of the fireplace at the best angle for reflecting heat into the room. He also insisted upon surrounding the burning fuel with a non-conducting material, such as firestone or fireclay, which retains the heat and materially assists complete combustion, so that double the amount of heat may be obtained with the consumption of the same quantity of coal. The fire-brick grates, now so common, are almost all made in conformity with the essentials laid down by Rumford, and indeed many of them are superior in some respects to those constructed under his own superintendence. He condescended also to study the proper mode of laying and maintaining a fire so as to avoid the unnecessary production of smoke, insisting upon the proper distribution of coal in the grate, which should be in pieces of a convenient size, and placed so as to allow of the free passage of air between them ; while in replenishing the fire also with fresh coals the same thing should be observed, so that it should never be smothered by too large a supply of fuel thrown on at once.

For lighting a fire, when the ordinary coal used in London is employed, some such directions as the following should be observed. Over the bottom of the grate should be placed a little paper to light the wood, but not too much, as paper in the mass is far from being a very combustible substance, and it leaves in burning a heavy ash, which is apt to damp the fire. Then should come the wood, which of course ought to be quite dry, and not packed too close ; and over all the coal, hand-picked, and not shovelled on, but arranged so as to leave openings for the circulation

of air and the escape of the gas and smoke, which, as soon as they are sufficiently heated, burn into flame. The fire after lighting should be watched for a minute or two, to see that the wood has kindled and is communicating its heat to the coals. For non-bituminous coals much more wood is wanted, and the coal must be in large pieces, and will take long to burn up. It is very desirable that the proper mode of lighting a fire, together with some other matters of practical elementary physics, should be taught in the schools where our future housemaids may be receiving their education. Without disparaging other subjects of instruction, it is enough to say that few would be more really useful in every-day life than this. It must not be forgotten, as the first thing of all, to ascertain that there is no down-draught in the chimney, otherwise the fire when lighted is certain, for some time at least, to vomit forth the products of combustion into the room, with all the familiar concomitant miseries. The best way of doing this is to hold a piece of lighted paper above the grate, and see whether the flame ascends or is blown downwards, in which latter case the door of the room must be shut to cut off the communication with the air in the rest of the house, and a window opened. Even more detailed directions may be wanted than these, unless the domestic engaged in the operation is an intelligent specimen of her class, for it has been known that, orders having been given to hold a piece of paper up the chimney, as above mentioned, the household auxiliary has been found some minutes afterwards on her knees before the hearth, and sedulously holding up in her hand an unlighted piece of paper, expecting this, as it may be supposed, to operate as a charm. There have been many mechanical contrivances for feeding the open fireplace with coal, so as to avoid smoke, in which the principle is to supply the fresh fuel at the bottom of the fire. This has been attempted by having a reservoir of coal beneath the grate, to be raised by a winch or by a simple lever as more coal was wanted. But these things easily get out of order, and none have had any practical success. There have also been designs for rotatory grates, by the action of which the fresh coal, after being placed on the top of the fire, may be made to assume a position underneath it, so that the freshly generated smoke must pass through the hot coal above, and so become ignited.

We have dwelt, perhaps, at too much length on these simple and homely details, but it is because by attention to these apparently little things fires can be well lighted, and made to burn well during their appointed times. And every fire properly lighted, and made to burn properly afterwards, means so much smoke prevented, and is a small but distinct diminution of the prevailing nuisance. If every domestic fire in London was managed as well as it might be, the volume of London smoke would be unquestionably very materially diminished.

It is not proposed here to discuss the questions connected with the causes, or possible prevention under certain circumstances, of the occurrence of fogs. They are among the great and ordinary meteorological phenomena which go to make the planet, upon whose surface we live, what it is. They can only be controlled very partially and in extremely limited localities, and are no more under human direction than are the seasons and the general weather. In extensive geographical regions fogs are perpetual, they flank certain sea-coasts like an impenetrable wall. In general, however, this appearance is fortunately rare, and their continuance in a particular spot depends either on the absence of wind to disperse them, or on the existence of vast atmospheric circular currents, cyclones and anticyclones, which keep the fog floating about in the same place, like chips in the eddies of a stream of water. Mention, however, should be made of the ingenious theory of Mr. John Aitken, communicated to the Royal Society of Edinburgh in December last. He concludes that there would be no visible vapour of water in the world unless there were present in the air particles of minute dust to assist and promote its formation. Laboratory experiments, on a small scale, seem to afford some support to this hypothesis, which Mr. Aitken pushes to the extent of asserting that if there were no dust in the atmosphere there would be no fogs, no clouds, no mists, no visible steam, and probably no rain. This, of course, means that wherever these constant phenomena occur, even in the highest regions of the atmosphere, there must be dust suspended in the air; a conclusion so vast and novel, and importing so many fresh points to be considered in the constitution of the world in which our lot is cast, that one may be excused for not hastily adopting it, and for waiting at least for further artificial experiments upon a much larger scale; and it is to be hoped that Mr. Aitken will continue his most interesting and useful line of research.

A very able contribution to the subject of London fog was made by Dr. Alfred Carpenter to the Society of Arts in December last, and he points out that the prevailing smoke nuisance in London, and other large towns, such as Brighton, is not really due to fog, but simply to the presence of unconsumed particles of carbon in the air, arising not from factories, but from the chimneys of dwelling-houses. At Brighton there are no factories, but a large collection of well-to-do families, who would have well-replenished fires in all their rooms, and especially in the kitchen towards the usual hour of dinner in the late afternoon, when the smoke of Brighton is at its worst. In London, where the Sunday dinners of the great mass of the inhabitants take place about the middle of the day, and are more important meals than on other days, it is at or before noon that most smoke may be expected on a Sunday.

Dr. Alfred Carpenter relies much upon the substitution of gas for

coal in the domestic fireplace, and contends that it might be supplied for this purpose at a price which would make its use economical. His own experience is in favour of gas stoves, so arranged that at first sight they cannot be distinguished from an ordinary coal fire; and he says that if he had gas in all his rooms he could do with one servant less in his household. He adds that gas fires can be fitted to existing grates, and points out their enormous advantages in a sick room, to give a constant temperature by day and night, and by which the noise of poking the fire and putting on coals is entirely avoided. Dr. Carpenter's proposal of an impost upon badly constructed fireplaces in private houses is, for the present at least, inadmissible. Hearth-money was always a hateful tax, and would not now be tolerated even in the interests of health and economy. Other matters of scientific value are discussed by him, but these references are intended to deal solely with the more practical parts of a most useful paper.

Mr. Rollo Russell, in his recently published pamphlet on London fogs, truly shows that artificial London smoke, without any natural fog to combine with, is alone sufficient to occasion great darkness in London, and, of course, it is alone sufficient to produce all the dirt of which we have to complain. A stratum of smoke may form in the upper region of the atmosphere, and then act as a thick pall to intercept the rays of the sun, which may at the time be shining quite brightly in the open country, beyond the reach of metropolitan smoke. This phenomenon of smoke without fog may be sometimes seen at Brighton, when the wind blows from the shore and the smoke of the town is carried out to the sea, over which it is flung for miles like a black and dismal banner, blotting the bright sky of that naturally sunny place. So, as Mr. Russell remarks, may the long line of smoke from its funnels be seen lingering in the track of a steamer long after it has passed; and in the country the smoke from a cottage chimney, on a still day, will form a flat cloud in its neighbourhood. Mr. Russell also shows that the climate of the country regions surrounding London is now injuriously affected by London smoke. Richmond is not now what it used to be, but is invaded by smoke; and once, after two days of north-east wind, he counted one hundred and six particles of soot on a square inch of snow in Richmond Park. Mr. Russell's personal observations of London fogs are very interesting and valuable; and he dwells with much force and sympathy upon the deleterious influence of London smoke upon the poorer classes, who have not even the resource of occasional escape from it into the purer air of the country.

The lecture delivered at the Society of Arts in January last, by Mr. W. D. Scott Moncrieff, was too remarkable not to be here mentioned. It contained the outline of a vast and ingenious scheme by which all the coal to be consumed in London should be rendered smokeless. By the aid of the gas companies, it is proposed that

smokeless coke shall become the universal fuel of the future ; but that the coal, from which the coke results, shall not be so far deprived of its inflammable gas as to render the coke also incapable of burning with a flame. Mr. Scott Moncrieff estimates that four millions of tons of coal are annually consumed in the house fireplaces of London, together with two millions of coals which are reduced to coke in the process of extracting gas from them by the gas companies ; and these four millions of tons of coal would form a square rectangular solid mass with a base of about 200 yards, and a height of the cross on St. Paul's Cathedral. He proposes that all this coal should be used for making gas, and should therefore pass through the retorts and gasometers of the companies ; and this, it is affirmed, would double the illuminating power of the gas supplied, and also double the commercial value to the companies of the residual product, besides saving the value to the public of the present yearly loss of fuel which escapes unconsumed from the fireplaces of London in the shape of smoke, which he calculates at over two million pounds sterling.

This is indeed a gigantic proposal, but even if the gas companies were tempted to undertake its reduction to practice, the questions would have to be asked, whether the space at their disposal would admit of such an extension of their operations, and suffice for placing additional apparatus for the manufacture of gas, or still more for the storage of the whole coal supplies of London, and of the resulting coke, the enormous quantities of which have been just now indicated ; and whether such a monopoly, and such an interference with existing interests, are likely to be allowed. The simple practical remark may also be made, that the result of a hot fire without smoke, but with flame, may be at present easily obtained by a judicious mixture of bituminous coal and of the ordinary coke as now sold by the gas companies.

The object now in view is to try to explain what are the practical bearings of the great smoke question, and especially to point out that the great source of the existing evil is the domestic fireplace, to which it will be difficult, if not impossible, to apply any legislative coercion or control. But an attempt has been made to show that without any, or with but little, alteration in existing grates, much may be done to abate the mischief, if only attention is given to enforcing the precepts of common sense, and by making the best use of our existing means, and the simple precautions within the reach of all. If every householder will learn the art of laying, lighting, and replenishing a fire, and will impress the necessity of knowing it upon all the members of his family by example and instruction, and will bring, if necessary, some pressure to bear upon the enforcement of the right thing to be done, some advance will be made while we are waiting for more complete and scientific remedies. The gain would be great if we could only get rid of a quarter of the present amount of smoke.

Twenty-five per cent. would be a diminution well worth struggling for; fifty per cent. would be a vast improvement indeed, and there need be no despair of this much at least being achieved. We are engaged in a war with the powers of darkness, and it is a contest for life, health, and happiness, for the vigorous prosecution of which it is worth while to take a good deal of pains, to incur some trouble, and to go to some expense—and it need not be great expense—in modifying old grates.

It is indeed, in Roman phrase, a fight ‘*pro aris et focis*,’ but one in which, unfortunately, the domestic hearth is often found ranged as an enemy, and in rebellion against the interests of the household gods. There is, however, happily no fixed reason why London should be the murky place it so often is. At early morning, before the fires are lighted, the atmosphere is as clear as that of Paris. Legislators returning home from a long sitting of their house, and all who are either out late or up early, may still look upon a London as fair as that which Wordsworth gazed on from Westminster Bridge, when he ‘saw it all bright and glittering in the smokeless air.’

To restore the air of London to its natural purity, to diminish the present amount of preventible disease and death, to bring back the roses to the cheeks of the London children, and to the London parks and gardens, to prevent our buildings, our pictures and other works of art, our libraries, and all our belongings, from destruction and filthy defilement by the soot-demon, is an object surely worth as much energy and perseverance as we are capable of devoting to it. All must devoutly wish that the public efforts now being made towards the accomplishment of such objects may be crowned with early success. But it is on individual exertion that the triumph of the general and combined effort must ultimately depend.

W. F. POLLOCK.

THE STATE OF PARTIES.

THE condition of the House of Commons at the present moment can hardly be considered satisfactory by any one of the various parties which now sit within its walls. Of the two sections into which the Liberals are divided, neither can avoid the reflection that it occupies a false position. The Conservatives must feel that while the present distribution of forces remains unaltered they are deprived of their natural allies, and compelled to submit to representations of their own principles at the hands of both friend and foe which are damaging to their usefulness and popularity. The House, upon the whole, presents a scene of much confusion; and the impatience of party discipline which is visible on both sides finds its counterpart in that contempt for the authority of the House at large which actuates the workers of obstruction. If it is true in any sense that lookers-on see most of the game, the remarks of one, however humble, who has looked on at the game of politics for a good many years with deep interest may contain perhaps some particles of truth not wholly unworthy of consideration.

Nothing is more frequently repeated by members of the Liberal party, whenever reference is made to its alleged want of unanimity, than that such must necessarily be looked for in a party constituted like their own. Freedom of thought, they say, is of the essence of Liberalism; discord, not harmony, is its vital principle; it must have room in which to speculate and expatiate—

As far as may be to carve out
Free space for every human doubt
That the whole mind may orb about.

Without this independence, this free play of idiosyncrasy, it would cease to be Liberalism; and it is useless, therefore, to complain of a characteristic which makes the thing to be what it is. If it sometimes places the party at a disadvantage in conflict with a more united and homogeneous antagonist, this is more than counterbalanced by the superior breadth and vigour which it imparts to their counsels and their policy. But it seems to us that those who use this language habitually overlook a distinction which materially affects the value of this peculiar virtue. The Liberal party is an equivocal term in this

country. It may mean either one of the organs of Parliamentary government: a body of gentlemen whose business it is to assist the ministers of the Crown in the transaction of necessary business, and at the same time to watch over the interest of certain recognised political principles; or it may mean one whole division of the nation outside of Parliament, which, with certain watchwords and certain aspirations in common, is subdivided into numberless groups or sects each with its particular chief, roaming freely over the whole expanse of political and religious thought, and owing little or no allegiance to any one general system or supreme lord. In this sense of the word no political party can wear the harness and submit to the discipline, the silence, and the subordination which are necessary to Parliamentary efficiency; and it is mainly because Liberals are so slow to recognise this truth, and will persist in fancying that the Liberal party in the House of Commons must be just what it is out of it, that the anomaly is prolonged to which we are about to call attention. The party, in the second of these two senses, is of comparatively recent growth; it belongs to an age of speculation; it is necessarily hostile to restraint, privilege, or tradition. The country is large enough to hold it: the House of Commons is not. The same quality which constitutes its strength in the one, constitutes its weakness in the other.

Hence it has followed that this great outside party, by the necessities of its position, has come to be dually represented in the Lower Chamber; informally, unconsciously, gradually, but really and effectively. The theory to which old-fashioned politicians still so fondly cling, namely, that the Liberal party in the nation is represented by a party in Parliament exactly as the Conservative party in the nation is represented by a party in Parliament, no longer works. It is, in fact, obliged to be represented by two if not more parties. And this, in our opinion, has led by degrees to a very serious derangement of the whole political machine, amounting almost to an inversion of the rule by which it is supposed to be conducted. Parliamentary government is supposed to be government by majorities. But government by majorities becomes impossible, unless there is a clear preponderance in the House of those who think alike, and can be relied upon to act alike, on all important questions. With three parties we tend towards government by minorities. It is idle to maintain that this has always been to some extent the case; and that cliques and coteries have always existed in Parliament aspiring to hold the balance between the two great parties, and to give the victory to either according to the exigencies of the moment. There have been such cliques, of course; but they belong to a period of our history when the conditions of Parliamentary warfare were totally different, and when *manœuvres* of this kind had no material or lasting effect on first principles of policy. Nobody would dream of calling the

Radical party in the House of Commons at the present moment a clique or coterie; and the absurdity of comparing its action to the action of the King's friends or of the Grenvillites, or of the Canningites, each of whom in turn aspired to the position we have mentioned, needs only to be named to be recognised. The position of the Radical party in the reformed House of Commons is something entirely new. It has a definite and distinctive creed to which it is resolved if possible to give effect. It has as good a *locus standi* in the House, exhibits as many notes of a regular Parliamentary party, as either Whigs or Tories, Liberals or Conservatives. It is at present a small minority, yet it is virtually master of the situation; quite strong enough, as events have shown, to neutralise the will of the majority, and to extort compliance with its own ideas, in spite of the notorious fact that the greater weight of opinion in the House of Commons is secretly opposed to them. It may be that this anomaly is even now drawing to a close. It is perfectly possible that, brought face to face with each other in the same cabinet, the Whigs and the Radicals have already learned a lesson which could never have come home to them otherwise, through the medium, that is, of those indirect and casual communications which, though they may indicate tendencies, do not naturally evoke ultimatums. Office sublimates opinion; and the intensity and tenacity with which particular views are entertained by certain members of Her Majesty's Government may now be better understood than they were twelve months ago. But as long as the Radicals remain where they are, their party will be Mayor of the Palace. Hitherto it has done well for itself; and though it might still do better by taking up a position of perfect, instead of one of imperfect, independence, nevertheless in the kind of triangular duel which parties have been fighting in the House of Commons it has certainly come off the best.

The result, however, is, as I have already stated, in direct contradiction to the only principle of Parliamentary Government which the people of England understand. According to this the majority ought always to be able to impress its will upon Parliament; and with only two parties in the House it always can. With three parties it may possibly be prevented from doing so, and a small minority overrule for the time being vastly superior numbers both in and out of Parliament. We may be told, perhaps, that those who agree to act together for the time being must be regarded as one party; that we have no right to look below the surface, and that the combination of the Whigs and Radicals in the present House of Commons is, for all practical purposes, a majority. This I deny. The fallacy lurks in the word majority. In the old days of party this meant a combination of men who thought alike on all the great questions of the day, not the temporary union of men who think very differently on them all for the attainment of a particular object. This used to

be called a coalition. And the difference is most important. Because, unless it is to be the test of the unity of a party, and, therefore, of the legitimacy of its majority, that it does think alike on the cardinal principles of government, it is impossible for the constituencies to know with any certainty what they are about in an election. If Radicals and Liberals may be one party to-day and two to-morrow, according to circumstances, the minds of the electors who incline to that side in politics must be in a state of hopeless confusion; and men will slip into Parliament only to swell the strength of parties with which many of those who helped to return them have no sympathy whatever. We return, therefore, to our original position, that we have now three regular parties in the House of Commons; that the system of Parliamentary government as established by our forefathers never contemplated more than two; that with more than two the machine cannot work properly, and inevitably tends to throw an undue share of power, and sometimes the supreme control, into the hands of minorities.

If we suppose, instead of three, five or six different parties in the House of Commons, it would be easy to show that the consequences must be still worse. For an able minister could always play one against the other, and with the help of his official *entourage* beat them in detail. We must remember, moreover, that the more parties there are, the more they must resemble factions, and that the more they resemble factions the more unpopular they are certain to become.

It is important to bear in mind the footing on which parties stood between the Revolution of 1688 and the Reform Bill of 1832, the period within which the system was gradually matured. We mention these two dates because they are the most familiar landmarks. The system did not finally settle down into working order till some years after the first, and became a little unsteady for some years prior to the second. But my meaning will be clear enough. During the greater part of that long period, comprising very nearly a century and a half, the speculations of political philosophy found little or no echo within the walls of Parliament. A few broad and simple questions then divided politicians from each other, and on most of them the vast majority of Englishmen were ready with their ayes and noes. Thus it was quite possible for the two parties in Parliament to represent the two parties outside into which the nation was divided. The questions which distract us now had not then come in to complicate our party organisation. Controversies as to the nature of property, the value of a State religion, the uses of an aristocratic order, lay far apart from the practical life of the period, and never lent even a tinge to Parliamentary controversy; nor did they, indeed, interest any considerable section of the public. The divisions of public opinion and the division of Parliamentary parties exactly corresponded.

Can this correspondence be restored without breaking up the House into such a number of sections as shall virtually destroy the party system? To this question we need not despair of being able to give an affirmative answer. If, under all the various names and shades which greet us on the surface, English political thought is still capable of being divided into two essentially distinct schools, it ought not to be impossible, it ought even to be easy, to reconstruct two parties in Parliament which should represent them with sufficient accuracy. We must not enter at any length in this article into an inquiry which could only be adequately pursued in a separate essay, but we believe it might be shown that between the two theories of society represented respectively by the principle of equality and the principle of subordination, there is really no middle term. Those who look forward to the realisation of the first of these ideals, though they may differ widely among themselves in enthusiasm, in intensity of conviction, and in eagerness for immediate action, all belong to one party, and ought to be able to act together in Parliament without any sacrifice of principle. All such, on the other hand, as believe that equality was not made for man, and that he is the happiest and noblest when he has something to look up to and to reverence, also belong to one party, and should be able to act together as a Parliamentary connection without any but superficial differences. Legislation and progress are as necessary for the one as the other. But the Conservative will reform our institutions with the view of retaining their original intention, and the Radical with the view of discarding it. The distinctive characteristics of the two parties might be drawn out at great length, but the further we went the more clearly should we see that they start from contradictory ideas between which compromise is impossible. You may cut either creed in half, but by so doing you destroy it. Well then, the question is whether we cannot make the above two principles, which are perfectly distinct from each other, and are broad enough to embrace a great many minor shades of difference, serve as the bases of two great Parliamentary parties, neither of which need require of its members either to suppress or abandon anything which they believed to be necessary, or to undertake or support anything which they believed to be mischievous. If it should be possible to do this, and if such an idea should ever be actually realised, the system of party will be placed once more upon a healthy footing, and we may, perhaps, hope to hear the last of the declining efficiency of Parliament.

A word or two may be given to the present arrangement of parties, and to the results which flow from it not only in the shape of giving power to minorities, but also of impeding that temperate constitutional progress which all but fanatics desiderate. The Tory party was originally distinguished from the Whigs by its

zeal for the Royal prerogative, and under a Joseph the Second might have been the Liberal party in the State. Unfortunately, when they fell back from this their primitive position, and came to occupy ground on which there was very little real difference between themselves and the Whigs, it seems to have been still thought necessary to keep up the old distinction, and for this purpose new names were found desirable. The Tories became Conservatives and the Whigs became Liberals. By right, after 1832, there should have been a new division of parties. But instead of this they tried to go on as before; and we now see what came of it. The Whigs, by the necessities of their position, were obliged to place themselves in opposition to a party which was confessedly the supporter of the Constitution. Thus they ceased in the eyes of the people to be what they had always prided themselves on being, the constitutional party in the country. It became gradually impossible to maintain that the Whig function was any longer the guardianship of the Constitution against all innovators. Had the Whigs in 1832 passed a less sweeping Reform Bill they might have kept together a party at once popular and constitutional. But as it is, they have allowed these two attributes to become separated, and the so-called popular party in the nation to be exhibited in an attitude of constant antagonism to the supporters of our national institutions.

The Tory party, on the other hand, as a further consequence of this mistake, has tended ever since to become more exclusively a defensive party, and to expose itself to charges of dishonesty, or inconsistency, or immorality, or nobody knows what monstrous crime, if it attempts any vigorous reform. The existing arrangement paralyses at one and the same time both the conservative force of the Liberals, and the liberal force of the Conservatives. But in the contingency we have supposed this could hardly be the case. When Parliament knew of only two parties—the organic reformers who believe our whole social and political fabric to be founded on falsehood, and the constitutional party which thought exactly the reverse, it would be impossible to tie down the latter to a policy of inaction. A party combining in itself the traditions of Pitt and Canning, and Russell and Peel, and Althorpe and Grey, could hardly be accused of insincerity for introducing any series of administrative or social reforms which left the essence of the Constitution, the integrity of the Empire, and the structure of society untouched. Under the present false division of parties, constitutional progress of this kind becomes impossible. While the Whigs are united with the Radicals, the Radical element must, as we have said, prevail, and the Whigs be towed along, however unwillingly, ‘at the wheels of their triumphal car.’ The Conservatives, in turn weakened by separation from their kindred, will be always exposed to those taunts and reproaches both from their friends and their enemies to which we

have already referred, if they propose any effective legislation ; taunts and reproaches which it is hardly in human nature to defy, and which are constant temptations to the silken couch and the slumbrous policy from which they awaken to destruction. But fuse the two parties, which are already one in heart, in principles, and in traditions, and you directly have a party strong enough and popular enough to be at once constitutional and progressive, without laying itself open for a single moment to any charge of inconsistency or dishonesty.

If, finally, we turn to the Radicals, we find a party which, being the legitimate issue of the Reform Bill of 1832, occupies an intelligible position, and is strong in proportion. It is in fact so strong, that it would be perfectly well able by itself to discharge the duties of opposition, reinforced, as it certainly would be, by a considerable number of 'Liberals' who are now Radicals at heart, though they do not as yet choose to call themselves by that name. The whole Liberal party, in fact, is divided into three sections, those who would be Conservatives if they were obliged to choose, those who would be Radicals if they were obliged to choose, and those who are Radicals already. These last two sections if united might be nearly two hundred strong, quite powerful enough to act as a check upon the Government, especially if we allow them the assistance of the Home Rulers. The real Radical party, in fact, is now sufficiently numerous in the House of Commons, and supported by a sufficient body of public opinion outside, to be entitled to take the place of a responsible Parliamentary opposition, and it ought if possible to be compelled to assume this function. It should be drawn out from behind the Whigs, and set on a hill by itself in broad daylight. The country would then be better able to judge of its aims and aspirations, which it cannot well do while the party lies beside its aristocratic friends, shoots its arrows from behind their backs, and catches the reflection of their opinions to such an extent that the discordant elements of the whole heterogeneous mass seem insensibly to melt into each other. Under the influence of this illusion the innocent British public imagines that the Radicals are being 'kept straight' by their allies. That day is passed for ever. The conditions of the game are altered. The players have changed places. What the Whigs once did to the Radicals, the Radicals are now doing to the Whigs.

Democracy cannot be dodged. It is time that idle dream were given up. But it may obtain successes out of all proportion to its real strength, through the blunders or supineness of its adversaries. I offer no opinion on the actual strength of the democratic party in England, or the popularity of democratic opinions at the present moment. I only say that if they possess the power which is sometimes assigned to them, no mere 'management' will long arrest their triumph ; and that if they do not, they are more likely to acquire it

while the trumpet of their opponents gives forth an uncertain sound, and the friends of the existing order are divided and distracted, than when the voice of the majority declares with unmistakeable and decisive emphasis that it is resolved to maintain that order. I know what is to be said against 'a hard and fast line.' I shall be told, perhaps, that an exclusively Radical opposition means in due course of time an exclusively Radical Government, with far more power to give effect to revolutionary principles than is in anybody's hands at present. The answer is the same. The power would be none the less for a small infusion of aristocrats, who would have no real influence, and only help to throw the public off their guard. We can understand the objection to having all the Conservative party ranged on one side, and all the Revolutionary party on the other, with nothing to break the collision, or moderate the 'ugly rush.' But it seems to me that this is the state of things which practically exists now, and that the Whigs, who are sprinkled among the Liberal party, are so much lost to the Conservatives without really doing anything to weaken the power of the Radicals. Does not the course of events during the last twelve months conclusively prove as much?

In an article published two or three years ago by Mr. Goldwin Smith in the *Fortnightly Review*, the writer dwells with great power and some bitterness on the relations between these two parties. He, indeed, took the view which down to last April was the prevailing one, namely, that any change in the relative strength of parties which might be expected from a general election would be all in favour of the Whigs; and that if Lord Beaconsfield were displaced, a moderate Whig Government would follow. But what does he say? What is his advice to the Radical party? Why, it is to have no more to do with these allies unless they will declare boldly for the whole Radical programme. This he believed was impossible, and therefore he recommended his friends to consult their own dignity and credit by forming an independent opposition, even at the risk of remaining out of power many years. Events have turned out differently, and he might now perhaps give them different advice. But I quote his opinion because it shows that his conception of the situation was substantially the same as my own; that in his opinion the alliance between the Whigs and Radicals had hitherto resulted in placing one or other, if not both, in a false position; and that the Radicals would do themselves a great injustice by consenting to consort any longer with their aristocratic friends, on condition of either sacrificing or postponing any of their own favourite ideas. This notion, then, that a mixture of Whiggism can temper the asperity of Radical principles, and dispose the whole party to acquiesce in a policy of Conservative compromise, belongs to the past, and derives no support at all from anything which is visible at present. The stronger party simply keeps the weaker on one side, so that it may

be well out of the way in the coming struggle. And the ugly rush, if there is any chance of such a thing, would be just as probable with the Whigs where they are now, as if they had followed the example of '93, and gone over to the Tories. They would be borne along with the torrent, which they would have no more power to arrest than the farmer has to stem the flood which he sees about to sweep away his flocks. Thus the argument in favour of three parties, drawn from the supposed danger of a hard and fast line, collapses when seriously examined, and leaves the objections to the system which I have here stated without any countervailing advantage. It transfers to minorities the power intended for majorities, and thus creates a want of harmony between Parliament and the country; it is a bar to the formation of a party which most moderate men desire, uniting the Conservative instincts of the Tories with the reforming traditions of the Whigs; and robs the party of order and prescription throughout the nation of a great part of its natural strength. When I began to write this article I meant to lay the most stress on the first of these evils; and if I have failed to do so, I still think it the most serious: more likely than any of the others to weaken the confidence of all but the very lowest classes in the representative character of the House of Commons, and to loosen the foundations of that system of party without which, as many persons think, Parliamentary Government on the principles of the English Revolution could no longer be conducted.

T E KEBBEL.

THE PĀRSĪS.

THE Pārsīs, who are merely colonists in India, derive their name from Pārs (in Arabic, Fārs), the proper name of a particular province of their mother-country. The name was afterwards applied more generally to a whole territory which was thence called by the Greeks Persis, and became known to us as Persia. The Persians call their own country Īrān, and themselves Īrānīs—names derived from the same root as the Sanskrit Ārya. Ethnologically indeed both Persians and Pārsīs are quite as truly Āryans as the Brāhmins. The Pārsīs are, moreover, followers of a religious system based on a modification of the original Āryan creed. This was the system which was developed in Bactria and reconstructed on a purer basis by the reformer Zoroaster, as described in a previous paper. When Zoroastrianism passed into Persia proper it was again modified by the circumstances of its contact with the Magian system, and when it ultimately reached India—brought there by fugitive Persians flying from the persecuting Muhammadans—it was again subjected to changes through its contact with the Indian systems.

Like the Jews the Pārsīs are a peculiar people—a people who have had to suffer great persecutions at the hands of others, and who have been driven from their native land by fanatical Muhammadans—adherents of a monotheistic creed not altogether without points of similarity to their own. Persia, the holy land of the Pārsīs, and Palestine, the holy land of the Jews, are both held by Muhammadan races. The Pārsīs, however, are far less numerous than the Jews; nor have they been scattered throughout other nations in the same manner. A few thousand still remain in their fatherland, Persia, chiefly at Yezd and the surrounding villages. The remainder have found an asylum in India. These are the sole surviving representatives of a religious system which once prevailed over an immense extent of territory, and was adopted by the whole Iranian nation.

Numbering little more than 70,000 persons in India, the Pārsīs of the present day would be lost to observation in the vast ocean of that country's population were it not for certain peculiarities which cause them to stand out conspicuously from the countless millions by

whom they are surrounded. Their distinctive character is marked by their dress. No one who has lived in any large Indian city can fail to be familiar with the picturesque costume of the followers of Zoroaster, their high brimless hats set a little back so as to form an angle with the head. Even in the crowded thoroughfares of London and Liverpool the dismal monotony of European dress is occasionally enlivened by a Pārsī head dress; for no prohibitory laws of caste, like those in force among the Hindūs, exist among the members of the Pārsī community, and no fear of excommunication deters any individual of this enterprising race from seeking his fortune in countries beyond the sea. Doubtless, custom and tradition exercise no slight influence over his conduct, but they do not overrule all other considerations. The one ruling passion of a genuine Pārsī is the love of making money. His solitary idol is the solid rupee. He turns with disgust from the hideous idolatry practised by his Hindū fellow-subjects. He offers no homage to blocks of wood and stone, to monstrous many-headed images, grotesque symbols of good luck, or four-armed deities of fortune. But he bows down before the silver image which Victoria, the Empress of India, has set up in her Indian dominions.

Let me now reply to the two questions left unanswered in the previous paper, namely, Why and how was the religion of Zoroaster expelled from Persia and transferred to India? What modifications have the Indian Pārsīs introduced into the Zoroastrian creed?

In replying to the first question, it will be necessary to go back for a moment to ground already traversed.

A rapid survey was before taken of the early history of the Irano-Aryans. After the line of monarchs commonly called Achæmenians came the Seleucidæ and Arsacidæ (= Persian, Ashkānī), who ruled the Persian empire in succession. Then followed the patriotic Sāsānian dynasty (Sāsānidæ), so called from Sāsān, the grandfather of their first king, Ardashīr. This line of kings addressed themselves earnestly to the task of restoring Persian nationality, which had almost become extinct. The first monarch, Ardashīr Bābakān, collected, as we have already seen, the scattered fragments of the Zoroastrian sacred writings, and revived the ancient Persian religion, infusing into it much of its old vigour and activity. For a period of about 400 years from his reign in the third century (about A.D. 225) to that of Yazdagird, the last king of the same dynasty (A.D. 651), Zoroastrianism escaped all persecutions, and thrived in the sunshine of royal favour.

Yet it could scarcely have taken firm root in the heart of the people, for when the fanatical Muhammadans, under the Khalif Omar, overran the country with the sword in one hand and the Kurān in the other, terminating their military successes by the defeat of the last Sāsānian king, Yazdagird, at the battle of Nāhā-

vand,¹ in the middle of the seventh century, a very small proportion of the people had the courage to adhere to their national religion. True, the two religions had this in common—that they were both nominally monotheistic, and both unidolatrous. They had other elements, too, which tended to mutual attraction and affinity. But the supplanting of the Avesta by the Kurān, and of the prophet Zoroaster by Muhammad, could scarcely have been effected had not the hold of the Zoroastrian system on the religious convictions of the nation been gradually weakened. In point of fact, the memory of the Bactrian prophet was no longer fresh. The Zoroastrian canon of Scripture had been tampered with, mutilated, and almost destroyed, and the Zend language, in which its doctrines were contained, was no longer generally understood.

Yet the entire Persian community did not embrace the new faith. A certain number manfully resisted all pressure and remained true to their ancient creed. These took refuge in the mountain fastnesses of Khurāsān, or in the outlying deserts, where they practised their national religion in peace for about a hundred years. Even there, however, in course of time persecution overtook them; and, although a certain proportion continued to occupy Yezd and Kirman (where they still linger in a wretched condition of ignorance and poverty even to the present day),² a large number emigrated to the island of Ormus, at the entrance of the Persian Gulf. Eventually this was found to be a station too accessible to their Muhammadan persecutors, and, after a stay of fifteen years, the Zoroastrian fugitives engaged vessels and set sail for the west coast of India. Their first halt took place at Div or Diu, one of the earliest settlements of the Portuguese, at the south-eastern extremity of Kathiāwār. There, for the first time, the Pārsīs made themselves acquainted with the language, habits, and customs of the Hindūs during a sojourn which is believed to have lasted for about fifteen years. Thence they moved on by sea to Sanjān in Gujarāt (twenty-five miles south of Daman), landing there about A.D. 717. The district around Sanjān was ruled by an enlightened Hindū chief, named Jadao Rana. Before allowing the Zoroastrians to settle in his territory, he demanded a declaration of their religious creed, which they were careful to give in such a form as to bring into prominence any points of agreement between Zoroastrianism and the Hindū system. 'We worship,' they said,

¹ Also written Nihāvand. The date of the battle is believed to have been about the year 642 of the Christian era.

² These were visited by Professor Westergaard, of Copenhagen, in 1843. He found the majority in a miserable state, much oppressed and unfairly taxed by the Persian Government, as they still are. Their ignorance of their own religion was extraordinary. No complete copy of the whole Avesta existed among them, though there were a great many copies of the Khurdah Avesta, and a few of the Vendidad and Yasna. They are contemptuously called Gabars by the Persians, and being debarred from many means of livelihood, often become gardeners.

'the Supreme Being, the sun, and the five elements. We make offerings to fire; we are worshippers of the cow; we practice ablutions with go-mutra (liquid excretion of the cow). We wear a sacred garment (*sadara*) and girdle (*kustī*); we pray five times a day; we use music at our marriage ceremonies; we perform annual religious rites on behalf of our ancestors.'³

The Hindū Rāja was satisfied with this explanation, and allowed the fugitives to settle at Sanjān, where they erected their first fire temple in their adopted country as a thank-offering to Almighty God for having at length granted them a resting place (A.D. 721).

For three hundred years after this date the Pārsīs are said to have resided quietly at Sanjān, enjoying peace and prosperity, and multiplying so rapidly that many of them were compelled to seek other settlements in Gujarāt, at Sūrat, Nowsārī, Broach, Cambay, and elsewhere. It is supposed that about this period, and for two hundred years subsequently, their numbers were increased by repeated arrivals of fresh emigrants from Persia.

At the beginning of the sixteenth century a powerful Muhammadan chief, who had established his authority in a neighbouring district, attacked Sanjān. He was at first repulsed by help of the Pārsīs, who fought valiantly on the side of the Hindū Rāja, but in a subsequent battle the Muhammadans were victorious, and the Pārsīs being routed left Sanjān, and sought refuge with the colony at Nowsārī, taking with them the sacred fire which they had consecrated eight hundred years before, and maintained in the same fire temple ever since. Some time afterwards jealousies and disputes occurred between the old and new colonists. The fire was, therefore, removed to Udwarā, 32 miles south of Sūrat, where it still continues in the most ancient of all existing fire temples, and is held in the greatest veneration by all orthodox Pārsīs.

After the establishment of the English factories at Sūrat in 1611 the Pārsīs who had settled there rapidly increased in numbers, and by their energy and aptitude for business achieved great eminence as traders. In process of time they even won the confidence of the Muhammadan Nawābs of Sūrat, and were elevated to influential offices in the State. Some of them became great shipwrights, and one of their number, named Nek Sāt Khān, an artisan of unusual skill, found favour with the Mogul Emperor himself. This man is said to have obtained important concessions for the English merchants at Sūrat.

Of course, the English had no sooner gained possession of the island of Bombay than Pārsī traders and shipbuilders began to establish themselves there also.

In short, from the first dawn of our political ascendancy on the west coast of India, the history of the Pārsīs has been one of

³ See Dosabhoj Framjee's *Parsces*, p. 112.

uninterrupted advance and prosperity. But the community has never increased numerically except within itself. Proselytising has never been attempted by the Zoroastrians since their arrival on Indian soil. No person, as a matter of fact, ever becomes a Pārsī except by birth.

In my repeated visits to Bombay I had many opportunities of conversing with a high native Pārsī authority, Mr. K. R. Cama. 'How is it you make no efforts to gain proselytes?' I once asked. To this he replied in the following manner:—

There is nothing in our religion which forbids our making converts. On the contrary, it is clear from the *Avesta* that there were formerly missionary fire priests, *Athravas* (*Athorvans*). History tells us that great wars were waged against neighbouring tribes for declining to accept the religion of Zoroaster. The *Shāh Nāmāh* mentions wars of this kind. Zoroaster was commanded by Ormazd to teach the wicked as well as the pious. It is true, however, that at present we have no missionary organisation, and that we admit no one within the pale of Zoroastrianism except the children of Pārsī parents.⁴ We consider that we have enough to do in making converts among our own people, who are generally quite ignorant of the truths of their own religion.

Such being the present state of feeling among the Pārsīs, it is evident that any great increase of their community, now numbering less than one hundred thousand souls, is highly improbable.

The second inquiry to which we have to address ourselves is, What modifications Zoroastrianism has undergone through its transference to Indian soil? It must not be forgotten that India, though once closely connected with Persia, and possessing much in common with it, is a country teeming with a heterogeneous population of its own, and abounding in every variety of race, language, creed, and superstition. Brought into connection with so many fresh associations, it was inevitable that the religion of Zoroaster should suffer change and adulteration. Even before it was banished from Persia Zoroastrianism had not escaped the usual fate of all human religions. It was already lapsing into that confused jumble of doctrines and superstitions which appears to be the ultimate outcome of the action and interaction of man's devotional faculties in all countries where no powerful resisting influences, like those of Christian dogmatic truth, neutralise the ordinary tendencies of human religious thought. It was already drifting in the same direction as Hindūism. In point of fact its sacred writings appear to have been constructed on somewhat similar lines to those of the Hindū religion. Both series of writings were the work of numerous authors who succeeded each other during many succeeding generations. Both begin with monotheistic ideas. Both exhibit as they proceed an increasing deviation from the simplicity

⁴ Occasionally the illegitimate children of Pārsī fathers and Hindū mothers have been admitted, and in rare instances domestic slaves or servants, but the legality of such admission is disputed by orthodox Pārsī parents.

of their first theistic conceptions. Both tend to polytheism and pantheism; the one through fanciful personifications of philosophical abstractions, the other through more coarse and material processes of impersonation. In both there is a combination of dualism with polytheistic and polydemonistic ideas. In the Avesta we have the eternal principles of good and evil evolving innumerable antagonistic forces which confront each other in eternal opposition; in the Indian Śāstras we have an infinite number of personal gods and demons arrayed against each other in actual conflict. But here the resemblance stops. The deterioration of Zoroastrian doctrine was arrested at a definite point, whereas Hindūism developed into an all-comprehensive corrupt system which may be described as a loose conglomerate of pantheism, dualism, polytheism, and polydemonism held in cohesion by an alleged monotheism.

Even the Vendīdād, though it reveals a perpetual dread of personal demons, and is far inferior as a literary production to the Atharva-Veda and code of Manu, never teaches the necessity of propitiating or worshipping any other Being but the One God.

Hence, notwithstanding the transference of the Zoroastrian scriptures to India and the drawing of the two ancient religions, which had always many similar doctrines and practices, more closely towards each other, the Indian followers of Zoroaster have always set their faces like a flint against idolatry, and have never adopted any ritual beyond that of the ancient fire ceremonial, which was once common to both Irano-Āryans and Indo-Āryans, but has now been nearly abandoned by the latter, and would soon disappear from India altogether were its continuance not secured by the Pārsī colonists.

Of course it would be impossible to deal exhaustively with all the peculiarities of Indo-Zoroastrianism within the limits of a single paper. The subject has so many ramifications that a volume might be devoted to its treatment. All I propose doing is to give an outline of Pārsī religious ideas, based on my own personal inquiries and observations in Western India. And perhaps it may conduce to clearness if I introduce the sketch by recapitulating briefly some principal points of the monotheistic creed taught in the oldest portion of the Avesta. We there learn that there is but one omnipotent Supreme Being, called Ahura Mazda (or Ormazd), the creator of the universe and the source of all life, power, wisdom, and truth. In his wisdom he ordained that while all matter—which every Zoroastrian believes to have been absolutely created by Him and not an emanation from Him—remained substantially one and the same, it should be ever assuming new shapes. Infinite change and infinite succession were to be necessary factors in the perfect economy of the cosmical system. New matter was never to be created, but old corporeal frames were to be constantly broken up to furnish material for new formations. The creative agency of

the Supreme Being was called his Spento-Mainyus, the destructive or disintegrating agency his Angro-Mainyus (Ahriman). The latter was quite innocent of all malevolent intention; it merely helped the former by providing the raw material of creation. But man was created a free agent. He might choose evil or good. He might resist natural laws or precipitate the action of the creative and destructive agencies by his own self-will. He might help to destroy matter by his own ignorance or wickedness. Hence the evil associated with destruction was not the work of Angro-Mainyus but of man only.

And, according to Zoroastrianism, whatever is done by human beings to assist creation is good, and helps them to heaven; whatever is done to hasten destruction is bad, and leads them to hell. The very word for sin now in use among Parsis is *Gūnāh* (=Sanskrit, *Vināś'a*), meaning destruction; for when evil or sorrow are connected with such destruction, man's wickedness alone is responsible. There is no real evil in death, nor is Ahriman an enemy of Ormazd, but rather his own appointed agent of dissolution and disintegration—the complement of his own creative power. Of course, the popular mind was unable to grasp these ideas. In process of time Ahriman was converted into an evil being, existing as an eternal principle opposed to Ormazd, the good principle. Thus arose the later dualism, with the various orders of good and evil spirits ranged against each other in eternal opposition as already described.

Turning now to the latest phase of the Indo-Zoroastrian creed, I may state that a religious catechism was written in Gujarātī for the use of schools about half a century ago. In that catechism Parsi children are taught to say:—

We believe in the One God who created the heavens and earth, the angels, sun, moon, and stars, fire, water, and all things. Him we worship, invoke, and adore. Our God has neither face, nor form, nor fixed place. There is no other like Him. We cannot describe his glory, nor can our minds comprehend Him. He is said to have one thousand and one names; but his principal name is Hormazd, 'the All-wise Spirit.' He is also called Pāk, 'Holy'; Dādār, 'Distributor of Justice'; Parwardagūr, 'Provider.' In worshipping the holy Hormazd we should turn towards some of his creations of life and glory, such as the sun, fire, water, and the moon. Our prophet Zoroaster has taught us to know God as one, and Zoroaster as his prophet; to believe in the Avesta; to believe in the goodness of God; to submit to his will and obey his commands; to do good deeds, speak good words, and have pure thoughts; to pray five times a day; to believe in the reckoning of justice on the fourth morning after death; to hope for heaven and fear hell; to believe in a day of resurrection.

The foregoing creed, though of course a very incomplete statement, may help to correct the popular fallacy that the Parsis are fire worshippers. Fire is to them a mere symbol of Almighty power and purity. It is their Kiblah, to which they turn when they address

* But it is affirmed that in reciting a particular prayer called the Hormazd Yasht, or prayer to the Supreme Being, the face is not to be turned towards any symbol.

the Supreme Being. It is on this account that the term fire temple, as used by Anglicised Pārsīs, is objected to by the more orthodox, on the ground that it is suggestive of idolatry, whereas fire is never worshipped as a god. Herodotus expressly affirms that the Persians had no temples. Yet sanctuaries of some kind for guarding the sacred fire must have existed in his time, for they are referred to in the *Avesta*. It is common for orthodox Pārsīs, in speaking of fire sanctuaries, to name them from one or other of the three kinds of sacred fire, *Ātash Behrām*,⁶ *Ādarūn*, and *Dādghāh*. The popular vernacular term is *Agiary*, 'fire abode' (from Hindī *āg* + *ālī*). In Persian works the term used is simply *Ātash-khāna*, 'fire house.' The expression *Sāgrī* is only applied to temples erected for the performance of funeral rites near the Towers of Silence.

I may here mention that the principal fire temples I visited at Bombay, *Sūrat*, and *Poona* did not differ externally from small private houses surrounded by their compounds. I was not allowed to view their interior arrangements, but was told that an ordinary temple consists of two oblong quadrangular rooms separated by a partition, one room being set apart for the fire sanctuary, or holy of holies, and the other assigned to lay worshippers. In the larger temples there are often other rooms for the performance of certain ceremonies. The sanctum sanctorum has a large central stone, on which rests the vase-like censer containing the sacred fire, kept continually burning and fed day and night with offerings of fragrant wood and gums, such as sandal-wood, benjamin, and frankincense. Sometimes a goat is killed, not sacrificially, but for the sake of its fat, which is dried and thrown into the embers, on special occasions, to produce a brilliant flame. The priests, called *Mobeds*, who are always present in the sanctuary, have a piece of fine linen cloth (called *Penom*, or *Panām*) tied in front of the nostrils and mouth, to prevent the risk of polluting the fire by their breath or saliva while reciting the customary prayers.

A distinction is observable in the fire temples of the two parties, or sects of Pārsīs, who differ by a month in their modes of calculating the calendar. The revised calendar party (called *Kadmīs*) close their fire sanctuary against the gaze of the people; whereas the Conservative party (*Shāhanshāhīs*), who are by far the most numerous,⁷ make an aperture in the screen of the holy of holies,

⁶ The *Behrām*, which is the most sacred, is only located in six places, *Udūwārā*, *Nausārī*, two places at *Surat*, and two at *Bombay*.

⁷ About two centuries ago a learned Zoroastrian, named *Jamasp*, arrived at *Surat* from *Persia*, and expostulated with his coreligionists for having inserted an intercalary month (*Kabīsah*) at the end of periods of 120 years, and so thrown out the time of observing their festivals by thirty days. This led to a long controversy which derived its importance from the fact that the efficacy of prayers is thought to depend on naming the year, month, and day on which they are offered. At last in 1746 a certain number of Pārsīs, led by one *Mulla Firoz*, separated from the majority and revised

and allow the fire to be seen by lay worshippers from a certain direction.

Five different kinds of fires are specified in the Avesta. The difference between them is not well understood even by the most learned Pārsīs of the present day. They are explained to denote various calorific forces existing in nature. The *Ātash Behrām* fire, now regarded as the most sacred, is believed to be compounded from one thousand and one sources; and the *Vendīdād*⁸ describes some of the different fires needed to form it. These several fires are collected at an enormous expense whenever a new *Ātash Behrām* has to be consecrated.

With regard to the priests who serve in the temples, they belong to a distinct class or tribe of men, like the Hindū Brāhmins and Jewish Levites.⁹ The most general name for a religious instructor among the Pārsīs is *Herbad*, but the usual name for the sacerdotal class is *Mobed*; the lay community as distinguished from the priests being called *Behadīn*. No one can be a priest unless he is born in the sacerdotal class, which is divided into the two orders of *Dastūr* and *Mobed* (the latter being a corruption of the word *Magapati*, chief of the Magians). The *Dastūrs*, or chief priests, are not numerous.¹⁰ I was introduced to the head *Dastūr*, a kind of Archbishop of Canterbury, who resides at Poona, and found him a venerable old gentleman, courteous in manner, and very learned in his own way. The priestly class is always distinguishable by their costume from the laity. Every priest wears a perfectly white dress to denote purity.¹¹ Another distinctive mark is that he never shaves either head or face.

All the ordinary work of the priesthood—such as the daily service of the fire sanctuary, the observance of a complicated ritual, and the performance of all public and domestic ceremonies—falls to the lot of the *Mobeds*. The sons of *Mobeds* are held to be *Herbads*, but are not obliged to follow the sacerdotal profession. Any *Herbad* may, like a Brāhman, devote himself at his own option to secular occupation, and may discard the white turban for a dark one. Those *Mobeds*, who are trained to priestly functions from their earliest years, are generally very ignorant, and scarcely ever know the meaning of the *Zend* prayers and invocations they repeat at their ceremonies. Nor do they always understand the hidden significance of their own ritual, though they go through the whole detail with perfect precision. Professor Haug was permitted to witness some of their most

their calendar according to the ancient Persian reckoning. This reforming party is still small. The two parties do not differ in religious doctrine.

⁸ Westergaard's Edition, viii. 81-96.

⁹ Many of their purificatory rites may be compared to those enjoined in Leviticus.

¹⁰ Probably not more than six or eight in number. There are only two for the *Shāhanshāhi* sect in Bombay, and one for the *Kadmis*.

¹¹ Whether the white neckcloth of a Christian clergyman has a similar significance I do not undertake to say.

important ritual acts, such as those of the *Paragnah*, the *Yasna*, or *Ijashne*, and the *Darūn*.¹²

An elaborate *Yasna* ceremony was also performed in my presence when I was last at Bombay, by order of Sir Jamsetjī Jijībhai. Much that I witnessed reminded me of the descriptions in *Leviticus*, and the priests who performed the ceremony might have been lineal descendants of Jewish Levites. The analogies to Vedic ceremonial were also obvious. The two Mobeds who officiated were dressed in the usual sacred shirt and girdle, with waistcoat, trousers, and brimless turban of pure white linen. A low quadrangular stone table or platform in the middle of the room supported the ceremonial implements, consisting of vessels filled with consecrated water, cups and saucers all of brass, a ring, two crescent-shaped tripod stands¹³ with a bundle of wires, now used in place of the *Barsom*, or sacred twigs, which once played an important part in ritual observances. A metal reservoir filled with water, large enough for the immersion of all the implements, and two or three *Lotas*, stood close to the stone platform. On its northern side was a low stone stool on which sat the chief officiating priest, called the *Zota*, with legs folded under him in the usual Indian fashion. On the southern side was a vase-like vessel or censer containing the sacred fire, which, during the progress of the ceremony, was fed with fragrant sandal-wood and frankincense, and otherwise attended to by the second priest, called *Rāspī* (*Rathwī*), whose nose and mouth were, of course, protected by the usual linen veil.

The chief Mobed, after washing his hands, face, and feet, began the ceremony by pouring water six times over the stone platform. Then the metal cups and saucers were placed in various positions—sometimes, when filled with water, erect, and sometimes, when empty, upside down—with much recitation of prayers and invocations. The metal ring was deposited in one of the cups, and at a particular point in the ceremony taken out and bound round with three hairs from a white calf, to symbolise the eternal universe purified by Zoroaster's three precepts, 'pure thoughts, pure words, and pure deeds.' One wire was laid horizontally on two cups to represent body and soul presided over by the supreme Creator, *Ormazd*, while a bundle of twenty-two wires was placed on the two crescent-shaped tripods to typify the superintending care of that number of *Yazads* (or secondary angelic rulers), these again being bound round with six threads from a palm leaf to denote their subordination to the six *Amesha-spentas*, or Archangels. Then one wire was singled out

¹² *Darūn* is the name of the consecrated flat cake used at this ceremony. Notes descriptive of the ceremonies he witnessed are given at the end of West's edition of Haug's *Essays*.

¹³ The three legs of the tripod represent the three precepts of Zoroaster—pure thoughts, pure words, and pure deeds.

from the twenty-two, and laid alone on the tripods to denote the overruling power of the chief angel Srosh, exerted for the protection of the entire human race.

An important part of the ceremonial consisted in preparing the Homa. The chief Mobed took some broken stalks of the Homa—said to be a species of sea-plant brought from Persia—and putting them with pieces of pomegranate root into a mug-shaped receptacle made of metal, pounded them with a metal pestle, which at intervals he struck repeatedly against the side of the vessel, the ringing sound thereby produced being held to be an essential part of the ceremony. Then, pouring water three times over the compound, he converted the whole into a purifying decoction, part of which is drunk by the priests, and part reserved to be given to dying persons and new-born children. The Homa, of course, corresponds to the Vedic Soma.

The ceremony lasted for at least an hour. It appeared to me that its elaborate symbolism could scarcely have been followed intelligibly by any ordinary worshipper. The priests seemed to be intent on going through their appointed routine by rote with scrupulous accuracy, but without entering seriously into the significance of their own acts. All the duties of a Pārsī priest are in fact mechanical. He has no didactic functions of any kind. He never preaches to the laity, as Hindū teachers and the Muhammadan clergy do. The result is that Pārsī laymen are, as a general rule, disgracefully ignorant and indifferent on religious subjects. They know nothing of their own scriptures, and even the better educated can only understand the Avesta texts by means of Pahlavī, Pāzand, or Gujarātī translations.

To this rule there are, of course, some remarkable exceptions. A really pious layman is careful to perform his appointed religious exercises with scrupulous exactness. Indeed, the daily duties of an orthodox Pārsī are almost as onerous as those of a Hindū. His first act on leaving his bed is to put on the sacred shirt called Sadara. His second act is to wind the sacred cord or girdle (Kustī) round his waist with what are called the Kustī prayers, recited in the Zend language, unintelligible to the reciter. He takes the cord with both hands, holding it by its most central part. Then touching his forehead with it he invokes the aid of Ormazd for the destruction of all evil spirits and evil rulers. This sacred shirt and cord constitute the chief distinctive badge of a modern Zoroastrian. His investiture with them corresponds very curiously to that of the Jewish child with the under-garment called Arban Kanphoth or Talleth. It also answers to the Hindū boy's investiture with the sacred thread (*yajnopavit*), and may be compared in a manner to the Christian rite of baptism.

The Pārsī child is taken at the age of seven to one of the fire-temples, and in a room outside the sanctuary placed on a low stone

stool. There the initiatory rite is commenced by a kind of baptism performed by a Mobed who pours water over the child's head. Next it is taken out into the precincts of the temple, placed on another stool, and made to eat one or two leaves of the pomegranate—a tree held sacred by the Pārsīs, and always planted near their fire temples for use in purificatory ceremonies. Then the child, after being washed or rubbed with nirang, is required to drink a little of this nauseous fluid, held to be more efficacious as a purifier if it comes from the body of a white bull.

The act of investiture follows. It constitutes the most important part of the ceremony, and ought to be performed in the fire temple by several Mobeds, presided over by a Dastūr. When, however, parents are poor two Mobeds, or even one, may be sufficient, and a private room may answer the purpose of a temple. The Mobeds sit on the ground, and the child, whether male or female, is again placed on a stool before them. The sacred shirt is then put on, and the white woollen cord fastened on around it while prayers are recited and the child itself is made to repeat word for word the form of prayer he is required to say ever afterwards whenever the girdle is taken off or tied on again. The rite is concluded by one of the priests pronouncing a benediction and throwing over the child's head fragments of cocoa-nut, dates, and pomegranates.

The Pārsī shirt is made of fine white calico, linen, or cambric, according to the rank of the wearer. It has very short sleeves, and is shaped in a peculiar way at the neck, with a little pocket about one-inch square in front. This is always left empty, to show that the Zoroastrian religion is entirely spiritual, and its God invisible. The shirt often has a heart, symbolical of true faith, embroidered in front, and two stripes at the bottom, one on each side—each separated into three—to represent the six months of the half-year.

The Kustī, or girdle, is a long flat cord of pure white wool, rather like a broad lady's stay-lace. It is woven by the women of the priestly class, and afterwards consecrated, like the Hindū sacred cord, by the priests. It consists of seventy-two threads in the warp to denote the seventy-two chapters of the Yasna. Each of the two ends of the girdle is left without woof, and then braided to within an inch of the two extremities, where it is divided into three short braided ends. The girdle is tied over the shirt, and coiled three times round the body by holding the middle of the cord in front of the waist, taking the two halves behind and bringing them back to the front, where a double knot is tied in a peculiar manner. The remaining cords are then carried back behind, and another double knot tied there. In fact, the shirt and girdle are, in the belief of every Zoroastrian, a veritable sacred panoply without which he would be perpetually exposed to the assaults of evil demons, supposed to be ever hovering round him, watching for an opportunity to accomplish his destruction.

It is easy, therefore, to understand the importance he attaches to the proper manipulation of this spiritual armour.

But it is believed that elaborate personal purifications with nauseous animal fluids are also needed for a householder's protection.

Hence his third duty, after leaving his bed in the morning, is to rub face, hands, and feet with the liquid excretion (*nirang*) of a cow or ox, reciting at the same time what is called the Nirang prayer. This prayer ends with words to the following effect: 'All the evil thoughts, words, and deeds which I have thought, spoken, done, which are become my nature, all these sins, bodily, spiritual, earthly, heavenly, O Lord, pardon.'

After the application of Nirang the Kustī prayers are a second time recited, and again a third time after cleaning the teeth. They are repeated before all the regular daily prayers, before and after every meal, before all the necessary operations of nature, and before going to bed. It is not too much to say that with the great body of Pārsīs this constitutes the sum and substance of all religious service.

Not that the attendance at fire temples, or the repetition of other prayers, is altogether neglected even by hard-working laymen. The temples are open day and night, and every day in the year. Perhaps the attendance of worshippers is largest on the two months dedicated to the angels presiding over fire, namely, Ardibahisht and Ādar,¹⁴ and especially on the third and ninth day of these months, which are also called Ardibahisht and Ādar respectively. Moreover, the seventeenth day of every month, called Srosh, and the twentieth, called Behrām, are thought to be most appropriate for visiting the temples; not, however, for common prayer and congregational worship, which are as unknown among the Pārsīs as they are among the Hindūs. The laity are, indeed, enjoined to pray five times a day, in addition to the regular Kustī recitations, but there is no fixed time or place. They may visit the fire temples at any hour convenient to themselves, or may omit to visit them altogether. They may pray in their own houses, or in the open air with the face turned towards the sun or the sea. The daily prayers used in addition to the Kustī recitations may be what are called the Nyāyis—that is, praises of Ormazd, or of the sun (Mithra or Mihr=Mitra), or of fire (Behrām), or of the moon (Māh), or of the water (Ardvisūr)—or they may be the Yashts, which are also rather praises than prayers addressed to the supreme Creator, Ormazd,¹⁵ or to his six chief assessors, the Amshashands, or to the angelic beings (Yazads) presiding over all natural objects and elements. Patets, or confessions of sin, are generally recited before going to bed.

¹⁴ Ādar is the genius of material fire, whereas Ardibahisht is not material fire, but immaterial truth which is symbolised by it.

¹⁵ The Ormazd Yasht is especially used, and may be recited without turning towards any symbol.

If a layman visits a fire temple his usual practice is as follows. On entering the courtyard he applies to an attendant, who helps him to wash his face, hands, and all the uncovered parts of his body. No one can approach the sanctuary without purifying his person by ablutions. Next, the worshipper must unfasten his sacred girdle, and tie it on again with all the usual forms and recitations. On passing into the anteroom he repeats particular prayers. If he has said his daily prayers at home he has only to recite the *Ātash* prayers. He does this with his face towards the sacred fire visible through the aperture in the screen. Then standing before the aperture he presents an offering of sandal-wood, which the attendant priest places on the fire. When the wood is consumed the ashes are brought in a flat spoon to the worshipper. He touches them with his finger, applies the finger to his forehead, and departs.

It is allowable for Pārsī women to visit the fire temples equally with men, and to recite the same prayers; but, as a matter of fact, they seldom go there, except on occasions of birthdays or marriages, or on the great *Ādar* festival, and then only in the middle of the day, when males are likely to be absent. Formerly it was much the custom for women to worship at the temples in the fulfilment of vows made to avert sickness and calamity, or in acknowledgment of blessings prayed for and received; but the modern ladies of the period, though they have broken through many of the restrictions which kept them, like other Eastern ladies, in seclusion, and are passionately fond of appearing on public occasions, rarely show themselves at fire temples. In fact, they are quite as averse from church going as the Pārsī men of the period are. Yet it should be carefully noted that, in contrast to Hindu customs, a Pārsī female is not debarred from any of the religious privileges enjoyed by the male sex. Girls are invested with the sacred girdle exactly in the same manner as boys; and when they grow up are more punctilious than men in going through all the formalities of winding and unwinding, fastening and unfastening, making knots in the cord, and muttering unintelligible prayers.

It might be supposed that immediately after initiation a parent's next anxiety would be for his children's education. No one, however, who has resided in Eastern countries could entertain such a mistaken idea for a moment. An ordinary Pārsī parent's chief solicitude after his child's investiture is for its betrothal and marriage. His notions in this respect are very little in advance of those of a Hindū or Muhammadan, and he is far more extravagant than either Hindū or Muhammadan in decorating his offspring with costly dresses and jewellery.

Not unfrequently children are betrothed before their investiture, and even sometimes when infants; but the usual age is between seven and eight. The marriage takes place with all the tedious tawdry and noisy pageantry customary among the Hindūs, and is

often celebrated at great expense before the bridegroom has completed his twelfth year, an auspicious day being fixed by the family astrologer. Only recently have reformers laboured to abolish the foolish and demoralising practice of early marriage. The ceremonies of marriage resemble in many particulars those of the Hindūs, and ought to include a marriage procession. An important part of the ritual consists in placing the juvenile couple on two seats opposite to each other, tying their right hands together with a silken cord, holding a cloth between them and gradually winding the cord around their bodies, while a priest with a fire-censer in his hand stands by their side and exhorts them in the following manner :

Know ye that both of you have loved each other and are therefore now united. Look not with impious eye on others, but make it your study to love, honour, and cherish each other ; avoid quarrels ; adhere to truth ; be always pure in thought, word, and deed. Desire not other men's property, try to increase your own. Cultivate friendship with the good. Hold out a helping hand to the poor. Continue to respect your parents.

During the exhortation incense is cast into the censer by the priest, and at the utterance of a particular word the bride and bridegroom throw rice-grains on each other, the popular belief being that whoever succeeds in striking the other first will have the upper hand throughout life.

Of course, contact with Europeans, and the spread of English ideas are greatly modifying all social customs. But enormous sums are still spent on marriage festivities, which would be far more sensibly bestowed on the young couple, as a grant in aid, on their first start in life. As it is, the pair cannot afford the comfort of a separate household, but, when permitted to live together, continue, like youthful Hindū couples, to reside under the parental roof. In some households at least a hundred persons are sometimes congregated, including sons and grandsons with their wives. The Pārsis take great credit to themselves that they have not imitated the Hindūs in prohibiting the re-marriage of widows, and that their religion forbids the taking of more than one wife, except under very special or urgent circumstances.¹⁶ The validity of such circumstances was formerly settled by the Panchāyat—an assembly elected by the community to regulate its affairs, and decide upon all great social questions.

The power and influence of this Panchāyat has lately much decreased, but it is still a useful institution and does good service in the management of charitable funds.

When the young Pārī wife is about to become a mother, she is immediately removed to the ground floor, where she remains excluded from all communication with her family for forty days. The birth of a child in the lowest part of a house is supposed to symbolise the fact that a man's life should commence in humility. Five days after

¹⁶ Such as a wife's immoral conduct or barrenness.

the event an astrologer casts its nativity, draws out its horoscope, and predicts its destiny. He also settles its name, taking the first letter from the particular planet under which it was born. These practices are said to be borrowed from the Hindūs. They are quite as likely to have come from Persia; for a faith in astrology was as natural to the ancient Persians as it has always been to all the nations of the earth at early stages of their development. The wonder is that an intelligent and advancing people like the Pārsīs should still be under the dominion of such senseless superstitions. Surely the better educated among them can have no more faith in the family astrologer than an Englishman has in a gipsy fortune-teller.

As to the Pārsī funeral rites they have been fully described by me in previous essays. It is remarkable that in whatever points the Pārsīs have become imitators of Hindūs, Muhammadans, and Christians, in one respect they still keep themselves quite distinct. Their method of exposing their dead to be devoured by vultures on open stone towers—called Towers of Silence—and the funeral ceremonies connected with this practice are unique, and without a parallel in any other country of the world.¹⁷

It is generally believed that the spirits of deceased persons hover about in the neighbourhood of the Towers for three days after death. On the morning of the fourth day the soul is taken to the judgment seat of Mithra, and there judged according to its works done in the body. It has then to pass a narrow bridge called *Chinvat-peretum*, 'the bridge of decision,' the entrance to which is supposed to be guarded by a fierce dog. Sinful souls find themselves unable to pass this bridge, which, sharp as a razor—an idea borrowed from the Musalmāns—is the only passage over the gulf of hell to the gates of paradise. All their efforts are fruitless, and they ultimately fall into the chasm. The righteous alone are able to accomplish the feat, and are admitted to eternal bliss.

Before concluding this paper I must observe that in proportion to the greater intelligence and energy of the Pārsīs has been the beneficial effect of English education and civilisation on their character and customs. The change brought about and progress made are far more marked than in Hindūs and Muhammadans. Old superstitious practices, many of which have been derived from the Hindūs, are being rapidly abandoned, English manners adopted, early marriages discouraged, and female education promoted. A growing desire is also evinced to inquire intelligently into the principles of the Zoroastrian faith, to study the original text of the Avesta on which it is founded, and to sweep away the incrustations which conceal its purer doctrines. A large number of thoughtful Pārsīs are becoming earnest thinkers, and not a few are tending towards a form of simple Theism which, like that of the Brahma Theistic churches, may be gratefully

¹⁷ See my *Modern India and the Indians*. (Trübner and Co), third edition, p. 80.

accepted by those who are labouring for the spread of Christianity as a stepping-stone towards the wished-for goal.

At any rate it may be safely asserted that the Pārsīs are eagerly availing themselves of all the opportunities and advantages which the Government of Great Britain places at the disposal of every single individual among its millions of Indian subjects, irrespectively of race, rank, or creed. They are advancing steadily on the path of intellectual development; they have established schools for their young people of both sexes which are models of good management, and they are the only natives of India who encourage physical exercises with a right sense of their importance as a factor in the education of the whole man. It is common, indeed, to accuse the Pārsīs of too great fondness for sensual pleasure and good living, and it is quite true that fasting and abstinence form no part of their religion. But in fairness it must be admitted that they take as much care of their own poor as of themselves. Charity is an essential part of Pārsī religious duty. Not a beggar is to be found in the whole community.

In short, it is greatly to be desired that the Pārsīs may multiply more rapidly than they have hitherto done, and enlarge their coast beyond the limits of their present Western settlements. They are much wanted as an influence for good in all parts of India. They already constitute an important link between Hindūs and Europeans, and, in their energy and industry, their desire for knowledge, their efforts at self-culture, their loyalty to authority and obedience to law, they set an invaluable example to all classes of the community, and not unfrequently put their English rulers to shame.

MONIER WILLIAMS.

OUR NEXT LEAP IN THE DARK.

THE practice of having a subject carefully inquired into either by a Parliamentary Committee or a Royal Commission previous to legislating upon it, is happily not quite given up, though of late somewhat fallen into abeyance. It is satisfactory to know that a Royal Commission is now engaged on a searching investigation into the working of the different systems of land tenure in Ireland as a preparation for the measure which the Government have announced their intention of introducing on the subject. Indeed, the results of legislation thus preceded by special public inquiries have in several conspicuous instances, such as the Factories' Regulation Act of 1833, the New Poor Law Act of 1834, the Public Health Act of 1848, and the Act for regulating the Employment of Children in Mines, been so successful as to encourage further recourse to the same practice. On some questions the publication of the reports and evidence largely modified, on some actually reversed, the public opinion before prevalent, and on some created a public opinion where none had previously existed.

Many large and important measures have since been passed, and yet more proposed, by successive governments, but comparatively few based upon special previous inquiry.

Among these few cannot be reckoned any one of a series of Reform Bills brought in from time to time, culminating in the only one carried, viz. the Reform Act of 1867, most of the provisions of which are still in force; nor can the Ballot Act which followed it in 1872. The first of these two Acts, the outcome of a kind of Dutch auction between the two political parties, and therefore at the time deprecated by but few of us, was truly described in the House of Lords by one of its authors as a 'leap in the dark.' The second, the Ballot Act, might have been described as a leap into the dark, not indeed from the light, but from another variety of darkness.

We had had no experience up to 1867 of any quite satisfactory parliamentary franchise—satisfactory, I mean, not only as to the general character of the representatives elected under it, but also as to the general feelings of the people, electors and non-electors. Parliament, however, set to work in 1867 to amend it, on a plan which seemed rather the result of deduction from abstract reasoning, as

the principles propounded were applied chiefly with the aid of registration lists and census tables, than the result of induction from ascertained facts as to the actual working of our electoral system, parliamentary and municipal. These are facts not to be found in statistical tables, but only to be learnt from experienced electioneers, familiar not with parliamentary contests alone, but also with the manipulation of municipal, with a view to parliamentary, elections.

It is asserted by experienced conductors of similar or analogous investigations that if the preparation of the scheme for the Reform Bill of 1867 had not been confined to the Cabinet—if officers of practical experience, in the habit of sounding and exploring, with a view to electoral action, the depths into which the leap was to be taken, had been previously consulted—if such officers had been consulted as clerks of guardians who had been in the habit of acting as election agents in parliamentary contests, or town clerks used to dealing with municipal electors, among whom corruption has long been rife—they would have thrown much light on the whole subject. They would have pointed out, as morally certain to happen under such legislation, exactly what has been shown by the recent inquiries of the commissioners to have really happened under that Act, and would have confidently predicted the consequences which have excited so much surprise in the unsuspecting general public.

Then as to the other leap in the dark, the Ballot Act, the Conservatives were all in dismay about it, convinced that it would be their destruction as a party; the Liberals all in exultation, rejoicing in the identically same prospect. But the official witnesses above indicated, with their knowledge of the electoral masses, were confident that both parties were mistaken, and that the Ballot would only do just what it has done, viz. very little for either party.

It is under that Reform Act and the Ballot Act that those numerous instances of extensive electoral corruption have last year taken place, which have attracted so much attention abroad as well as at home, and have done so much to discredit the constitution under which we live.

Foreigners, unaccustomed to costly elections, cannot be persuaded that candidates would spend such large sums to get into the House of Commons unless they expected to obtain some pecuniary or other personal advantages in return. And must not the wage class draw much the same inference from this excessive expenditure, and the increased proportion of lawyers and directors of companies among the candidates? And do not many of them say, 'Why should I not only give the candidate my vote for nothing, but sacrifice some of my working time for him besides, when he expects to gain something worth having for himself by winning the seat? Why should I help a rich director or pushing lawyer gratis to gain what he wants,

when he gets highly paid for all his own time and work in his own business ?'

We are led very soon to expect a further Reform Bill from the present Government. But it is to be feared that they, like their predecessors, will take no steps to acquire the information requisite for the due preparation of a measure that must so seriously influence for good or ill the future destinies of the British Empire, and that it is more likely to be based upon 'flesh and blood' or such like theories than upon the well-considered results of carefully ascertained facts and recorded experience. There are as yet no indications that with regard to the causes, as distinguished from the fact, of the existence of such extensive electoral corruption, the Government have formed any plan for either instituting any special inquiries to ascertain those causes, or even for turning to account for that purpose, as far as they would be available, the commissions already engaged in the investigation of the corrupt practices themselves. It should be remembered, however, that these investigations are limited to certain constituencies, and are only held in consequence of the special reports of the prevalence of corruption there from the judges who tried the election petitions in them. Yet those causes are surely well worth investigating, and any moderate delay in consequence would be well worth incurring. Certainly the partial light thrown incidentally by the commissions last year upon the results of the leap in the dark is lurid enough. Indeed, judging from information reaching me from several quarters, with regard to the very extensive corruption practised at the last election in one borough, long notoriously corrupt, where, in the interest of both parties, a threatened petition was by agreement given up, it is to be feared that the disgraceful disclosures already made respecting several constituencies last year have been but as it were the lifting up of a corner of the curtain, which still veils a multitude of at least equally disgraceful instances of extensively corrupt constituencies.

In the four contests which I fought at Plymouth, I never remember so much as a rumour of more than a very few isolated and admittedly exceptional instances even of treating on either side ; and I was at the time assured that there had been no more than that since the Reform Act of 1831. But of late years I have been pained to hear a very different account of my old constituency, and I must add of several others generally reputed to have been formerly pure. In fact there seems reason for apprehending that too many victories on both sides last year, triumphantly appealed to since by each respectively as conclusive evidence of genuine political feeling, really proved no more than that one party or the other in the particular place had the longer purse, or superior dexterity in organising systematic corruption.

As I have said, it is clear from these election trials and inquiries

that the large addition made since 1867 to the borough constituencies has not rendered them pure, if indeed, as seems in many cases probable, it has not produced quite the opposite effect. It has unquestionably placed the representation of the boroughs absolutely in the hands of the wage class, whenever they choose to take it.

Thoughtful men had for years confidently anticipated a decided lowering of the franchise into a much larger as well as lower stratum of the community before long, and felt convinced of the serious consequences to be apprehended from it, unless accompanied by some corresponding wider extension of electoral power among the more highly educated, as distinguished from the merely wealthier, classes. It was this anticipation and this conviction that about a quarter of a century ago induced between 200 and 300 men, all well known, and many of the highest eminence in literature, in science, and in art, with the concurrence of such veteran Liberals as Lord Brougham, Lord Radnor, Lord Eversley, and my father, to sign a petition to Parliament on the subject, in collecting the signatures to which I took some part. In that petition they prayed that a separate representation might be given locally, not professionally, to men whose higher education had been publicly and responsibly certified; such, *e.g.*, as graduates of the universities, lawyers and medical practitioners, associated to form in each large county, or combination of small counties, a separate constituency to elect its separate member of the House of Commons. It was specially proposed that they should vote locally, not professionally, so that they might represent the higher education of the country generally, and not the particular interests or feelings of the different liberal professions separately. The idea was too novel to obtain favour either with the then leader of the Conservative party in the House of Commons, whose writings have all indicated a belief in a kind of democratic Toryism, or with the Liberal party, too many of whom seemed then, as they seem now, to consider a further lowering of the franchise one of the most urgent requirements of the country.

When, as we are led to expect from the past votes and speeches of many, and the quite recent declarations of some, of the present ministers, household suffrage for the counties is given to all the residents outside the borough boundaries, the political supremacy of the wage class, rightly described by Mr. Lowe as 'our masters,' will be complete. They are more numerous than all the other classes of the community put together, far less educated, and more habitually indifferent about politics, but capable of being roused into great excitement on some particular question, political, religious, social, or even (*e.g.* the Claimant) personal, which happens at the time to have engaged their attention. We cannot doubt the will—can we doubt the power?—of the ministry to carry such a measure, and that speedily.

It will then be (is it not already?) too late to inquire what has been hitherto the general course of action here, and what, therefore, would be the probable legislation of the wage class even as respects themselves—too late to draw any lesson from the votes of almost every democratic representative assembly, colonial or foreign. To the students of Adam Smith and Stuart Mill, of Bastiat and Chevalier, it appears to be thoroughly protectionist, and particularly injurious to the true interests of the wage class. In the judgment of political economists its tendency has been, by raising wages factitiously, to reduce the purchasing power of the money received by them as wages, and to raise prices against themselves. Are not Jack Cade's speeches about the seven halfpenny loaves for a penny, and the three-hooped pots that were to have ten hoops, typical of various wage-class leaders' speeches since? Can anything be conceived much more discouraging to superior skill and industry than the objection of so many workmen to piece-work—any policy more suicidal in a nation, absolutely requiring a large export trade to pay for the large imports of food necessary to the sustenance of a large portion of the population, than their too often triumphant opposition to the introduction of new labour-saving machinery? Mr. Stuart Mill, while earnestly protesting against the folly and injustice of this opposition, gave some amusing instances of it—*e.g.* masons not only refusing to build with machine-made bricks, but to have hand-made bricks brought to them on wheelbarrows instead of hods. Then as to their generally large expenditure in drink—some 60,000,000*l.* a year—and corresponding refusal to spend anything like the same proportion of their income, as all other classes do, to provide decent and wholesome habitations for themselves and their families, can any practice (to put it on the lowest ground of mere economy of working power) be more wasteful and improvident? To the ordinary operative, whose sole capital consists in his competent strength, competent skill, and competent character, any failure of health renders that capital unavailable. And yet, partly from his personal habits, partly from his unwillingness to pay for decent and wholesome lodging, and partly from general defects in structural arrangements for sewerage, water supply, &c., which he individually has no means of improving, it is certain that he loses on the average, in comparison with his contemporaries of the middle and higher classes, many more working days in the year through sickness, and many more working years of his life through premature old age, and death still more premature. Some say the remedy is to lower the franchise still further, so as to include more sufferers from unsanitary conditions, and enable them to elect men who in the municipality and Parliament respectively will support measures to prevent and remove these evils. But experience has unfortunately shown that with no class is sanitary reform so unpopular as with the wage class. I remember when 'the poor

man's pig' was a most potent election cry in various borough contests; and it was difficult to say whether the pig-keepers themselves or their non-pig-keeping next-door neighbours suffered most from the close proximity of the animal, or were most indignant at his compulsory removal. The men of their choice, too, have generally been hostile, or, at best, disdainfully indifferent, to sanitary reform. Most of the popularly elected town councils throughout the kingdom long resolutely obstructed sanitary measures; and the London vestries, in particular, fiercely denounced them and their authors. Indeed, it can even now by no means be said that nearly all these bodies take at all a just or enlightened view of their duties in this respect. Mr. Bright, and too many politicians of all parties, began by opposing, and have ever since notoriously neglected and contemned, sanitary reform, not at all to the detriment of their popularity, but rather the reverse. Indeed, he with perfect consistency, when President of the Board of Trade, strenuously resisted legislation for the detection and punishment of adulteration, even when not only fraudulent, but injurious to health, though the poor unquestionably suffer much more than the rich from these nefarious practices. 'Fancy franchises' having been successfully denounced by that too influential minister—far more distinguished for magnificent oratory than for legislative capacity, administrative efficiency, or sound political economy—it is useless now to plead on their behalf. It is too late now to ask with regard to boroughs whether fair indications, even short of proofs of habits of thrift as well as industry, happily much increasing in the wage class, might not be as deserving of consideration in fixing the qualifications for the franchise as conclusive proofs of being a *bonâ fide* lodger within a borough could be.

And then as to constituencies. There are several seats now vacant to be disposed of, and under a comprehensive Reform Bill there would probably be more. But it is, I fear, too late to expect any competitive examination to be held as to the fitness of the several constituencies proposed as candidates for them—their fitness, I mean, as being likely to contribute useful members to the Legislature in the men they elect. Sir John Lubbock, indeed, considering that the universities, which cultivate letters and theology more than science, are still allowed members, has proposed that a representative should be given to the Royal Society as one seat of science. The new Victoria University may be said to be another, and the Society of Arts, a chartered society a century and a quarter old, might have a concurrent claim. And if curative science and art, in the persons of the doctors, were considered entitled to a separate representative, then preventive science, at least as important to the community, would, in the persons of the few thousand officers of health, have corresponding services to plead. Certainly electors belonging to either of these bodies would hardly get drunk, break windows, and

require keeping in order by the police at election times, or be open to wholesale bribery and treating, which may be reckoned among the negative qualifications desirable in a new constituency. But is not Sir John Lubbock's, and are not all analogous proposals too late? Would the wage class approve of such 'fancy constituencies' any more than their eloquent, but (according to a late Liberal Prime Minister) 'narrow-minded,' representative, Mr. Bright, approves of 'fancy franchises'? And we must not forget that the wage class are already 'our masters' in the boroughs, and that the present Ministers have promised they shall be so in the counties likewise. For when their new Reform Bill is carried the votes of the wage class, wherever they choose to give them, will suffice to swamp those of all the other classes put together in every constituency except the universities.

Of course on the 'flesh and blood' theory this is right and desirable. But many, who were Liberals long before the gifted statesman who endorsed that theory became one, and some of us still surviving followers of theirs, always protested against such an abstract theory, and contended that good government with orderly liberty was the end to be sought whether in framing new or reforming old constitutions; that no Government could be considered good which did not give adequate security for freedom, and which did not work not only well, but on the whole acceptably, to the governed; and therefore that it was essential for a large proportion of the people to have a voice in the election of their representatives in Parliament.

When the leap in the dark was spoken of in the House of Lords as a durable if not permanent settlement by one of those Tories who reluctantly acquiesced in it, I ventured to reply that it seemed to me to have unsettled everything and settled nothing; that I felt sure it would be altered before two years (it was before one) had elapsed; and that no Reform Bill could be deemed just, satisfactory, or likely to last, which did not give the same franchise to the rural population as Mr. Disraeli's Bill did to the urban.

I added that the rural population was, in most counties at least, equally fit for it, not only because notoriously a smaller proportion of them were, according to the returns, convicted of crime or apprehended for drunkenness, but also because in many counties (though in all a majority of the sharpest boys sought better paid employment in towns) they were equally well educated with the borough population in other counties. I had previously got a friend to move in the House of Commons, while the Bill was under discussion, for a return in counties and districts giving the proportion of signatures to marks in the marriage register. I then showed that in my own county for instance, Devonshire, according to this the best available test, not only were the adult males in the Devonshire borough regis-

tration districts better educated than those in the Lancashire borough districts, and in the Devonshire rural districts better than in the Lancashire rural districts, but that those in the Devonshire rural districts were actually better educated than those in the Lancashire borough districts; and that the same held good with regard to several other manufacturing and mining counties. I then indicated very briefly my view as to the general principles on which, after what had passed, this just enfranchisement of the agricultural labourer could be most safely and satisfactorily effected. All that I have heard, read, and seen since, has confirmed me in my opinion, which, for that reason, I venture to explain now at somewhat greater length than I did then in the House of Lords.

In considering the fitness of the rural population for the duties and responsibilities of electors in comparison with that of the town population of the same grade, it should be remembered that they are far less exposed to the demoralising influence of the horrible overcrowding so prevalent in our larger towns. For in these, house-rent being much higher, a whole family has too often, what is virtually unknown in rural life, only a single room to live in by day and sleep in by night; and comparatively very few of the lower wage class in most towns enjoy the amount of accommodation becoming more and more general in the country districts, partly from the building of better new cottages, partly from the utilisation of existing farmhouses and cottages left vacant as the rural population diminished.

Now this view of the subject is really a very important one. I speak as a sanitary reformer of nearly forty years' standing who has worked hard and suffered seriously, if he has effected but little, in that good cause.

In preparing my address as President for this year of the Congress of the Sanitary Institute, I have had occasion to refer to some of the old authorities which I studied when preparing my lecture on the health of towns in 1845. In Mr. Chadwick's Sanitary Report of 1842 and in the general report of the Health of Towns Commission of 1845, and the detailed reports of their Assistant Commissioners, I found absolutely conclusive proofs that, as a rule, dirt, disease, vice and crime, together with gross ignorance on almost every subject except what is most demoralising in literature or the drama, are concurrent in the same districts and dwellings; and I found, from an almost continuous chain of evidence, that this has held good down to the present time. I am taking no low or materialistic view of man, marvellously compounded as he is of body, soul, and spirit; I am not questioning at all the elevating and purifying influence of Christian pastors and of Christian missionaries of either sex, or of Christian schools, ragged or otherwise, upon the unhappy denizens of filthy overcrowded and fever-haunted dwellings; much less am I doubting the fact that bright examples of consistent Christian excellence are

even frequently found in them, when I repeat, after thirty-five years of additional experience, what I stated in 1845, that 'as a rule, men cannot lodge like pigs and live like Christians.' The reason for this is most forcibly explained by Dr. Lyon Playfair in his admirable report on Lancashire towns in 1844, when, after citing the striking testimony of Mr. Clay, the benevolent chaplain of Preston Gaol, corroborated by that of the Inspector of Prisons in Scotland, as to the physical causes of disease becoming indirectly the cause of crime, he goes on to say :—

All the experience acquired during this inquiry points out that one immediate effect of the operation of morbid causes, even when not present in sufficient intensity to produce direct disease, is to create an appetite for vicious indulgences. It is too common a mistake to transpose the effect for the cause, and to ascribe the disease to the indulgence of those propensities which in the first place were created by the low sanitary state of the district.

Dr. Playfair had been speaking of the condition of the inhabitants of large towns. It contrasts in many respects strikingly, and in morals very unfavourably, with that of the mostly rural population of Irish counties. Yet I found from some old statistics relating to the four counties of Ireland with the then largest and smallest proportion of one-roomed mud-hovels respectively (the proportion of families occupying such tenements being in the first rather more than double what they were in the second case), that the same general law held good. The proportion of crimes of violence and passion, on an average of eight years to 1842, was 72 to 32; of rapes and assaults with intent, &c., 44 to 17; and of deaths from epidemics 48 to 36 per 1,000 in the four counties with the most and with the fewest of one-roomed mud-hovels respectively.

Dr. Playfair further remarks, with reference to the effect of premature and excessive mortality, that 'the tendency to crime becomes increased by the comparatively few old and experienced men left to counteract the haste and inexperience of youth.' It is sad and discouraging to reflect that, in spite of all our subsequent sanitary legislation (at first, in 1848, enlightened, but also too much in advance of public opinion, then retrograde and confused, and only latterly again both practical and enlightened), premature and excessive mortality has not been yet at all diminished as it might and ought to have been, since those wise and true sentences were written by the right hon. gentleman.

I thought in 1867, and think more strongly now, that, considering the greatly increased facilities for locomotion and transport, and the consequently greatly increased habitual intercourse and traffic of late between the town and country population, their sentiments and interests have become to a much greater extent identical than they used to be, except in the very large towns; and that, except in their case,

there appears to be no adequate reason for keeping up any longer a now in general simply arbitrary distinction between them, and all the less because many boroughs include within their boundaries a certain extent of purely agricultural land, and some, thanks to the survival of the freemen's franchise, an additional proportion of rural and other non-urban electors.

In order to continue a separate franchise to a certain number of electors with a somewhat larger stake in the country, I wished, and wish, as at present advised, to see every parish in England made part both of a borough and of a county, so that its householders might have the borough franchise, while those of its inhabitants who possessed the county qualification might enjoy the county franchise. Except in the case of the largest towns, which have a reasonable claim to consideration as being to a certain degree separate communities with separate interests, I should like to see the boundaries of boroughs extended for representative purposes so as to meet across the counties, so that, for instance, the cottagers in my parish of Filleigh should have votes for the neighbouring borough of Barnstaple; the farmers, the coal and manure dealer, and the shopkeeper at the station, renters of more than 12*l.* a year, having votes, as now, for the Northern Division of Devonshire; while similarly in Mr. Daniel's parish of Stoodleigh, adjoining the river Exe above Tiverton, the cottagers should have votes for that borough, the farmers equally remaining voters for North Devon. The very large cities to be dealt with exceptionally might (as Exeter, Norwich, Newcastle-on-Tyne, and a few other ancient large cities have been for centuries) be made 'counties of cities,' with their boundaries, perhaps, somewhat modified to facilitate improvements in their sewerage, drainage, and water supply; and might then have their third member elected on a county franchise instead of under the unsatisfactory minority clause, which utterly fails in its operation whenever a single vacancy occurs. We should thus, while giving general household suffrage, keep up a separate constituency as at present in the counties, with a decidedly higher qualification, which represents in the country, in rural villages, and in small market towns, a far greater difference of social status than it does in the large towns.

Moreover, as one who in Devonshire stood for years almost alone with my father in advocating representative county boards, now recognised by all parties as desirable, I venture to think that such an arrangement as I have suggested might tend to strengthen county feeling and to facilitate the unification and consolidation of local areas of rating and of local administration for various purposes, whose present chaotic confusion everywhere outside the boundaries of municipalities so much increases the trouble and impairs the quality of the local business transacted in them piecemeal, with great waste of time and cost. Parochial action has been within my own lifetime

superseded for almost all purposes. The parish, once the unit of English administration for the relief of the poor, the repair of the highways, and the maintenance of law and order, can, it has been truly said, only be described now as a place where a church-rate can be made but cannot be levied. I trust it may be replaced as the unit of local rating and administration by the union, with boundaries by mutual adjustment rendered conterminous with the counties, and all the petty municipalities, with their independent areas, merged for all purposes in the union. For these independent areas, generally very ill managed, are all the more absurd and inconvenient because they often comprehend large purely rural tracts. The municipality nearest me, for instance, in addition to several hamlets, many detached farm-houses and cottages, besides thousands of acres of arable pasture and woods belonging to several owners, includes one-third of my deer park and my largest covert, in which we recently found several wild red deer.

I am aware that such a proposal about the constituencies, though based to a certain extent on the old lines of the Constitution, would be little likely to be received with favour by the smaller boroughs, whose inhabitants, thanks to the privilege bestowed upon their forefathers of choosing and sending up burgesses to Parliament, have unjustly and anomalously retained in the Legislature an influence much beyond that due either to their population or their contributions to the Exchequer, or, indeed, to anything except their past history—and that, alas! has not always been unsullied. And they would like it the less because the greatly enhanced value of each elector's vote in a small as compared with a large constituency has notoriously often proved a temptation which too many of them have felt unable to resist.

The other alternative would seem to be that of equal electoral districts. But I confess my own strong preference at present for almost any arrangement, not too glaringly unfair, that would continue at least some of the traditions of our not inglorious past, and preserve, in an altered, but still recognisable, form, some parts of that Constitution which, in spite of its imperfections, made England for centuries the envy and admiration of all lovers of liberty throughout the world.

In the absence of any scheme proposed by any member of the Legislature other than the simple assimilation of the county and borough franchise by making both equally low, which it is hardly conceivable could be applied alone, without touching at all the general question of the representation, I have ventured to suggest these views with regard both to the franchise and to the constituencies. I have done so, if only to prove that all, who have for years considered the agricultural labourer at present unfairly dealt with in comparison with the lodger in some alley of some borough, do not agree with

Mr. Trevelyan as to the best mode of doing the labourer justice as a British citizen.

But I still entertain, as I said before, the strongest conviction that the vitally important question of a further reform of the representation of the people in Parliament ought not again to be legislated upon in the dark; but that the franchises, the constituencies, and the mode of voting best to be adopted under present circumstances, should be the subjects of ample and careful public inquiry, before Parliament proceeds to legislate upon either of them. *Vestigia nulla retrorsum*. Leaps of this kind once taken in the dark cannot be retrieved, however grave the lurid light of experience may afterwards show their consequences to be.

The next question that arises is as to the best mode of voting.

The ballot in England has probably protected the voter from the much diminished amount of intimidation to which he still remained exposed; though, according to an American statesman in a recent number of the *Contemporary Review*, it has completely failed to do this in the United States; while, according to the same authority, bribery is believed to have somewhat increased there latterly under the ballot. Be this, however, as it may, the evidence taken at the trials of election petitions last year, and still more that elicited since by the special commissions, conclusively prove that the ballot has been very far from preventing, if indeed it has diminished, while shielding, electoral corruption. I never believed that it would; though after having, as long as I sat in the House of Commons, sometimes at the risk of my seat, steadily opposed the ballot as being 'likely to do a little harm and less good,' I, later on, when called up to the peerage, supported the ballot as being 'likely (owing to the spread of trades unionism) to do a little good and less harm.' I did so, however, only because I despaired of the adoption for parliamentary and municipal elections of what I have always considered to be a far better system, viz., that established under the New Poor Law of 1834 for the election of guardians, which I have had some opportunities of studying as a pretty diligent guardian for more than thirty-five years, and secretary to the Poor Law Board for nearly four. This has gone on ever since side by side with the old unsatisfactory mode of voting at parliamentary and municipal elections, which obliges the voter to poll, whether by ballot or otherwise, at a polling place—a mode very expensive to candidates, as they know well to their cost, and so troublesome to electors, that a large proportion of them rarely vote at all in large constituencies unless conveyed to the poll in carriages, and either bribed or worked up into a state of excitement for the occasion. Even with all this, from one-fourth to one-third of the parliamentary electors in large boroughs generally have proved obstinately deaf to appeals of all kinds, and have not cared either to go, or be taken, to the poll. There was a contest in each of the

twenty four largest boroughs in Great Britain at the general election of 1874, and the aggregate number of electors who polled in them was less than two-thirds of those on the register. In that of 1880 there were contests in twenty-three of them, and the aggregate number of electors polling was only about three-fourths, notwithstanding the immense exertions made and vast sums expended.¹

In the election of guardians we have now had experience for more than forty years of the system of voting by voting-papers first left, and subsequently collected, by a public *employé* at the voter's residence. Only last October, at the Poor Law Conference of representatives of the boards of guardians of the North-Western district, a resolution, approving the principle of the system, was carried after discussion by forty votes to twelve in spite of the opposition of the President, Mr. Hibbert, M.P. No wonder, when I find from, I believe, the last return moved for in the House of Lords on the subject, that the total number of parishes, in England and Wales, in which there had been any question about the election of any guardian, during the years 1874 and 1875, serious enough to require an inspector being sent by the Local Government Board to hold an inquiry into it, was seven, of which four did not occupy at most more than one day each, one not more than two days, and two, in two parishes in Great Yarmouth, taken together, not more than thirteen days between them.

Another testimony in its favour is that I hear its principle has not unfrequently been adopted in the returns to postal circulars, substituted on account of their cheapness and convenience for a 'test ballot,' to ascertain the comparative acceptability of the respective candidates, when several have been started on the same side for the same constituency; thus securing unity of action in the party, and sometimes saving the expense of a contest altogether. Postal circulars, enclosing forms and envelopes duly prepared, have long been used to collect the votes and proxies of shareholders in companies and subscribers to charities.

Till the appointment of the Committee of the House of Commons in 1878, its practical success was never, to my knowledge, seriously impugned. I remember, indeed, some time after I resigned the secretaryship of the Poor Law Board, something like an attack upon it being threatened. I immediately wrote a memorandum on the subject for my late chief's private information. Mr. Baines, as soon

¹ I obtained these aggregate results by adding together the votes of the first and third successful candidates in boroughs with three members, and in other boroughs the votes of the candidate of each party highest on the poll, and then comparing them with the number of electors on the register. The proportion varied in 1874 from about $\frac{18}{100}$ in Westminster to little more than $\frac{1}{4}$ in the Tower Hamlets, and in 1880 from rather more than $\frac{11}{100}$ in Sheffield to little more than $\frac{1}{2}$ in the Tower Hamlets; the total number of electors on the register being increased by, in round numbers, 60,000 to 780,000 in 324 boroughs.

as he had read it, asked my permission to make it a public document, that it might be moved for in the House of Commons, soon after which it was equally moved for in the House of Lords in 1855.

In that memorandum, after citing from the *Edinburgh Review* the fact that at the general election of 1852, in contests for twelve large constituencies averaging over 14,000 electors each, hundreds more than Marylebone then had, only 55 per cent. voted, I mentioned an instructive contrast in the operation of the two modes of voting upon the ratepayers in the same parish. Under the Act of 1834, the Poor Law Commissioners thought they had the power of issuing orders to St. Pancras, and an election of vestrymen took place accordingly in 1837 on the new system. At that time the ratepayers were about 13,000, besides a certain number of owners with votes given them by the new Poor Law Act, of whom more than 7,600 voted. St. Pancras, however, and other parishes under previous local acts, were afterwards decided by the courts not to be subject to the Poor Law Commissioners' orders. So St. Pancras reverted to its old franchise and mode of voting under Hobhouse's Act. Under that there was a contest in 1853, when the ratepayers had increased to about 20,000; and though it was described as causing great excitement in the parish with colours, banners, and processions of cabs, the utmost number that could be brought to the poll was little over 2,700. But in 1879, out of the eight wards there, four with over 12,000 on the list were contested, when over 5,500 voted by voting papers collected from house to house. Mr. Rendle, Medical Officer of Health, told the Committee of the House of Commons on the Metropolitan Local Management Act, of which Mr. Stuart Mill was a member, that in his parish some 3,000 votes were collected out of some 5,000 voting papers sent out for the election of guardians; that while not one in a hundred in the parish knew much about the vestry election, and the vestrymen were usually practically elected by ten or twenty people, the guardians were usually elected by 2,000 or 3,000; that he himself was elected a vestryman by ten or twelve people, but a guardian by some 1,200. The Committee unanimously recommended the adoption of the system in use for the election of Poor Law Guardians. I never pretended that, owing to the very imperfect arrangements, consequent upon the very small remuneration allowed to the officers for this work (only a halfpenny per head of the population when there was a contest in parishes with under, and only a farthing with over, 500 inhabitants), there were not some facilities for malpractices, of which, independent of accidental carelessness, a certain number of instances could readily be found. I pointed out, however, that some of these facilities might easily and at slight expense be removed: indeed, I have learnt that some of them have since been obviated accordingly. Nor did I contend that the system admitted of being brought to such perfection as to protect

the voter effectually from being coerced either into destroying or making void his voting paper, or into filling it up in a manner contrary to his convictions. I only pointed out that a far greater proportion of electors were induced to vote by the ease and comfort with which they were thus enabled to do so; and that, therefore, the general result of an election so conducted, notwithstanding any possible careless or intentional suppression of some voting papers, or any compulsory perversion in the filling up of others, gave a more faithful representation of the real deliberate feelings of the whole body of electors than going to the poll gave, whether under the ballot or not.

I ended by expressing my conviction that the same system might advantageously be applied to parliamentary elections. I may add that the electors practically thus encouraged, not to say enabled, to vote instead of remaining unpolled, are by no means the least sensible or honest of the constituency. For, as I said in a pamphlet on 'Local Representative Self-Government for the Metropolis,' which I published in 1853 shortly before my triumphant return for Marylebone—

it has been shrewdly observed that, especially in the middle and lower ranks, those who occupy themselves most about elections and politics are either the best or the worst citizens. The best take part in public affairs from a sense of duty, religious or patriotic, from a generous spirit of attachment to the person or the cause they espouse. The worst busy themselves in party contests either from love of the excitement, the conviviality and gossip attending an election, or from the expectation of deriving advantages in the shape of patronage or jobs, which more high-minded men scorn. There is, however, a large intermediate class of men of average industry and character, who, caring much for their own interests and their families, and comparatively little for public measures or public men, can with difficulty be prevailed upon, however decided their preference, to support either one side or the other at the sacrifice of any of that time and trouble which they value so highly, and know so well how to turn to account.

The fact that increasing competition in work and business causes private affairs more and more to pre-occupy the thoughts and monopolise the time of more and more sensible and useful citizens, renders it the more important to facilitate their giving the public the benefit at elections of the very little leisure and attention at their disposal; that little being much more likely to be used to the public advantage than the days readily given up by the idle and thoughtless, or the labour devoted by the schemers and jobbers of either party to electioneering.

Besides having at different times, for nearly twenty years commencing with 1839, taken a part in contests in various places to assist Liberal candidates, I fought five contests myself, one unsuccessfully, because I refused to bribe, as my opponents did, whom I unseated on petition; and I was five times returned to Parliament,

once only without opposition. So I have had, in my day, a fair share of experience in contested elections.

My recollection is exactly what I hear from good authority [is the general statement of experienced election agents. The great difficulty, always and everywhere, is to persuade industrious men who know and care comparatively little about politics, but know a great deal about their own business and care a good deal about their families, to sacrifice their time and trouble in order to record their votes. And, of course, the difficulty is greater in large constituencies where the great number of electors renders each vote of much less individual importance than where the numbers are comparatively small. Each elector at Liverpool is about a sixty-thousandth, at Portarlington about a hundred-and-fortieth, part of the constituency. To some going to the poll in a carriage is something of a compensation, the pleasure of the drive, rather than the saving of time for work, being its recommendation to these voters. In my contest for Marylebone the cost of cabs, almost entirely for the conveyance of voters to their rarely at all remote polling-places, was 365*l.* out of a total of about 5,000*l.*, though I did not poll quite 7,000 votes, scarcely more than half the electors—a number, however, very much larger than ever had been polled there before. A friend of mine has received from several experienced election agents information to the same effect. They all agreed that very strong excitement was needed to induce electors to take the trouble of voting, unless other inducements had been either added at the time, or had been recently added at some municipal or parochial election.

We have the strongest evidence that under, no less than before, the ballot, polling at polling-places, when there has been no corruption direct or indirect, has led in large constituencies to the return of the representative not of the majority, but of an impassioned, and often a sectarian, minority.

To take one instance only out of many. The Roman Catholics at Manchester are pretty well known not to exceed at most, if they amount to, one-sixth of the population. Yet at one School Board election (and there is no reason happily for believing that School Board contests are yet appreciably tainted by corruption) a Roman Catholic was returned at the head of the poll, evidently only in consequence of greater zeal and superior organisation among his co-religionists. It is good that minorities should be fairly represented, but very bad that they should, owing to a defective system of voting, obtain over-representation, and, still worse, domination. The cost of these School Board elections is most serious, and has frequently deterred the most highly qualified and eligible labourers in the cause of education from becoming candidates. In large towns hundreds, nay, thousands, have been spent on School Board elections, and yet the proportion of electors voting was often notoriously not large,

though I am unable to say what it averaged ; while the average cost of the 710 contested elections of guardians in England and Wales (in 1875) was under 19*l.* each—no small consideration in these days of increasing rates, of distressed agriculture, and depressed, though we hope at last slowly reviving, trade. I may add that in 1879 there were one or more contests in 627 unions, or parishes on the footing of unions. In the parishes or wards where there were contests, there were a little over 1,500,000 ratepayers on the list, of whom very nearly 700,000 voted ; but the total expense for all was under 20,500*l.*

I know that much of what I have here suggested will, if they ever hear of it, be unfavourably regarded by those election agents whose income largely depends upon their reputation for bringing up voters to the poll in numbers, which, under the present law, nothing but the hardest work guided by the greatest skill and experience enables them to do. Nor do I expect it to be better received, if they deign to notice it, by managers of *caucuses*, who would equally find themselves to a certain degree superseded by voting arrangements which would render much of their well-planned organisation and well-directed labour superfluous. But I am satisfied that there is nothing in what I have here written at all contrary to those Liberal principles which I have consistently supported for more than forty years, and am still as warmly attached to as ever.

I have not the presumption to suppose that I have in this paper suggested a thoroughly satisfactory Reform Bill, or a complete remedy for the great and growing evils of electoral corruption. I only venture to hope that I may be considered to have made out some case for full and public inquiry into the vitally important question of the future representation of the people—that is, for endeavouring carefully to ascertain the best practicable constituencies, franchises, and mode of voting for adoption before again legislating upon them—and that I have adduced some valid evidence and arguments in favour of such previous inquiry, and against hastening wildly to take another ‘ leap in the dark.’

PORTESCUE.

January, 1881.

POSTSCRIPT.

Since writing the above I have seen the Bill of the Attorney-General. No fair man can doubt that it proceeds from a sincere desire on the part of the Government to prevent for the future practices which have not only disgraced our Constitution in the eyes of the civilised world, but tend also seriously to demoralise more and more of our population, of which the borough electors form a considerable and increasing proportion. That its stringent provisions will deter many from giving and receiving bribes and liquor, I earnestly hope and believe. But I am not sanguine of the Bill's complete success, even in this respect, much less that its operation as a whole would

probably be, if at all, nearly as beneficial as its authors anticipate. As I think I have shown already, the great difficulty even now is to induce voters to take the trouble of going to the poll. And that will not only continue, but increase, since much of the machinery now available for persuading the reluctant to vote is to be abolished and forbidden under penalties. The most respectable election agents being quite aware of this, and hopeless of producing in large constituencies, without thoroughly organised and systematic canvassing, the results expected by their employers, will more and more, I believe, decline the ungrateful office, and make way for others of a lower grade and with a lower standard. This of itself would be undesirable. But further, when the object to be attained is so very much sought after, we can hardly doubt that agents will soon be found ready, for an adequate consideration, to do the work of corruption, taking the risk of detection, exposure, and punishment. We have heard that in China a man may be got by liberal payment to undergo vicariously any punishment, even death. Imprisonment will have little terror, and exposure none, for a certain class of instruments. I have been credibly informed that one of the most active and effective agents at the election for a very large borough in 1874, at which, it is said, much more money was spent than had been supposed, was a person who was afterwards publicly announced as Liberal candidate for it. We shareholders learnt to our cost by his transactions as chairman of a large company, for which he was convicted and imprisoned, that the dread of the law was inadequate to deter him from illicit gains. But even if, contrary to my expectation, agents of a low class are found to be pretty effectually repelled, my fear is that these severe penalties will encourage the creation of secret organisations to do the work—one of the most dangerous tendencies of the present day.

Taking, however, the most hopeful view, and assuming that neither shameless agents nor secret organisations will be extensively employed to induce the electors to poll, we shall find another danger. The Attorney-General's Bill leaves upon the discharge of the important civil duty of voting a tax of trouble, which long experience shows to be prohibitory upon average electors in an average state, not of necessarily positive indifference as to the member to be returned, but of reluctance to spend the time and trouble required for polling. This practical *vis inertiae* is only to be counteracted by some corresponding motive power, either personal or political. If political, this practical apathy can only be overcome by adequate political excitement. Personal canvassing allowed the adjustment of this to the requirements of each voter. The substitution of oratory for canvassing will lead to its being often employed with a fervour perhaps not more than just sufficient to rouse some of the electors from a state of what may be described as political *coma*, but likely to produce in others a superfluous, nay mischievous, amount of what may be described as political frenzy. It is surely a great misfortune that voting in a calm and reasonable, if somewhat indolent, frame of mind should be so much discouraged. The danger is of members being returned by insignificant minorities of the constituency, either impassioned on behalf of some special religious or secular measure which they have honestly much at heart, or moved by some purely local feeling about some purely local matter, or else actuated by a keen sense of some deep personal interest or intense personal feeling. We should, I fear, find an utterly disproportionate influence exercised by extreme enthusiasts of all kinds—Ultramontaness, Ritualists, No-Popery men, Anti-State-Church men, Permissive-Bill men, denouncers of the Contagious Diseases Act, Anti-Vivisectionists—all honestly convinced that their own particular question has the first claim upon the attention of a Legislature charged with the interests of a whole Empire on which the sun never sets. Or we should find local, as distinguished from public, interests and feelings of predominant influence, and have donors of parks, founders of almshouses, and other conspicuous, but purely local, benefactors, of too often doubtful disinterestedness, returned, irrespective both of their politics and of their qualifications as legislators. Or else we shall find personal interests the motive power. And that these must be pretty intense to induce the average elector of a large constituency to go to the poll, we learn from the experience of the great commercial companies, which have only dozens, instead of thousands, of shareholders attending their meetings. Indeed, but

for the resource of postal circulars and the house-to-house collection of proxies, it is notorious that these concerns would every now and then be shattered by the unreasonable or sinister small minorities alone willing to attend.

Where a personal interest or public sentiment much stronger than that of a shareholder in a company is required to induce average electors to go to the poll, is it not formidably likely that such adequate private interest will be sinister; or that such adequate public sentiment will be the fruit, not of a quiet and reasonable political opinion, but either of intense yet narrow sectarian enthusiasm, or of violent yet petty local partisanship?

February, 1881.

TRANSPLANTING TO THE COLONIES.

IN the competitive examination of remedies for Irish ill-content, each claiming the first place and confidently undertaking to answer the most trying questions, we cannot fail to discriminate between those that are well grounded in subjects of general applicability, and that are good for all, and the special topics, more difficult, but, if possible, more indispensable, for the cure of local and exceptional need. In a recent letter to the *Times*, Lord Meath points out succinctly, but suggestively, the duty of keeping the distinction in mind; and while dealing with the well-to-do portions of the country only as they may require, grappling boldly, by measures administrative rather than statutory, with the overcrowding of half-famished sea-coast counties of the west.

Over-population never was less true as a general description of Ireland, and never more true of particular districts than at the present hour. What aggravates the mischief and misery is the obvious and unchangeable fact that the paralysing and pitiable congestion exists where the soil and climate are comparatively unfavourable for small husbandry, or the maintenance in comfort of a peasantry dependent on its produce alone. The venerable earl, who has had ample experience as resident proprietor, popular representative, lieutenant of his county, and contributor to all useful works in the Irish metropolis, wisely endorses the recommendation already urged by the best and ablest men of every degree, that Government should initiate a liberal and comprehensive scheme for finding farms and homesteads in our colonies for those who are not, and cannot be, accommodated as they ought to be in Donegal, Mayo, Kerry, and Clare.

Whatever be the tenor of the forthcoming Land Bill, this I am sure is a *sine quâ non* of future prosperity and peace. From personal observation I know the condition of most of these districts well; and I am convinced, not as of yesterday, that a more mistaken policy cannot be conceived than that which would tether the willing but wageless conacre man to a miserable patch of half-reclaimed bog or mountain, the rent of which he can only earn by harvest-work elsewhere, and the produce of which, even in a dry summer, cannot yield more than the barest and lowest subsistence for his family. Legislative changes more or less beneficial in Wexford

or Antrim, Tipperary or Tyrone, can have no adequate effect on him. If you gave him his (miscalled) holding for nothing, it would not materially mend his plight to-morrow; and after to-morrow that plight would be as hopeless and insecure as now. Primary schools, model farms, creeping railways, cheap postage, teetotal lectures, newspapers without stint, tracts on cleanliness, and the multiplication of branch banks, all can avail nought to put firm ground under his feet. To use his own familiar phrase, 'his father was the like before him, and he never had a chance of doing better.' He knows that some of his kin are doing well in America; and in a wet season he wishes he was there too. With sunshine and new seed he laughs again; but if the 'crop should forget to come up,' he curses the rent which the over-bidding of men like himself has made high, or the *gombein* he cannot pay. Again he wishes himself over the sea, where good land is plenty and wages are to be earned every day in the week. But the season is late, and he has not the means to go, and he lingers on moodily, wondering what may turn up, and ready to swell with his despair the voice of political discontent. The indisposition to labour often ascribed to him is refuted wherever abroad he gets the opportunity to work; but, where regular wages are not to be had from a want of middle classes of various degrees, the languor of disappointment and despondency grows habitual; and until the poor cottier tenant of the west is transplanted to happier soil, where his old griefs and habits may be alike forgotten, he can never be rescued from his destitution and discontent.

In a recent circular Mr. Vere Foster publishes a statement of applications for aid to single individuals to emigrate to Canada and the United States during the past year. Of these 335 were from Roman Catholic and 77 from Protestant clergymen, dispersed throughout the various dioceses from Raphoe to Cloyne. The cost of transit, about 9*l.* per head, was generally made up by contributions of three-fourths advanced by friends and relatives on promise of repayment, when possible, and one-fourth contributed by charitably disposed persons from a fund long established for the purpose. The parish priest, when vouching for the respectability of the applicant, seldom failed to speak of the necessity with regret; but he did not on that account refrain from backing the urgency of the claim. And if this be so when the intending emigrants are young and single women, how much more cheerfully might he not be disposed to recommend assistance for youths of the other sex, or in cases where whole families might be transplanted together! The want of sufficient means is the only obstacle in the way, for every consideration, moral, social, and political, tells in the balance in favour of household or village emigration, in preference to desultory efforts to aid the most healthy and adventurous members of the family. Ample experience proves that those who are thus assisted to go forth and seek their fortune

are not ungrateful or unmindful of the help afforded them in their hour of need; and every year since the humane method of assistance was first organised in 1848, large sums have been remitted in instalments to relations and neighbours left behind.

There is no reason why the same melody of affection, thrilling and true in every note, should not be arranged with accompaniments and chords; there is no reason why greater volume and power should not come of the harmony of concerted parts than of the single voice. Time out of mind the family has been the natural unit of emigration. If the roots must be loosened in the native soil, we believe without argument that they are likelier to take hold of foreign earth when removed in the bulb, and not exposed to chill and damage, one by one.

To the least imaginative or foreseeing of humankind the fear of loneliness casts a certain gloom over anticipations afar off. Gay one-and-twenty, without qualm for riven ties of friendship or companionship, readily dashes away the parting tear, and enters freely into careless chat with the first fellow-passenger on board that looks disposed to make the best of it. But the nature of the Celt, though venturous at short notice, is not for the most part deliberately enterprising. Courage is one thing; the confidence which the clear calculation of distant results can alone impart is another. The Galway peasant at fault for a living at home may screw up his nerves to go, and neither wince nor waver when it comes to the point. On a cold dark morning he bustles through leave-taking and is even glad to be off; but all the same he has yearnings and misgivings for weeks or months beforehand of being stranded by some unlucky chance beyond the reach of help or pity; and his fancy conjures up whole tissues of possible or impossible, improbable or incompatible bad luck, that may be awaiting him beyond the sea. And what he painfully stifles, mother and sister and old folk by the hearth dream aloud; or they read in the once cheerful fire a sad fate of the *buoghil*, the cabin's pride, or the dark-eyed colleen that never slept from under its low but loving roof. Could they all go together in the same ship it would be nothing, and if two or three of their neighbours as well,—it would be more of a new hiving than a clearing out. This would not be eviction, but joint and several emergence from the slough of despond on to firm ground of safety and hope. The risks and chances inevitable from all great changes in human life would remain; but they would no more haunt the silence of the night or the weary hours of the day. Content would supersede repining, and mutual encouragement take the place of reciprocal reproach; crossing the ocean would be migration rather than emigration—change of home rather than forsaking it. Looking at the matter from mere expediency's point of view, would it not be worth a rich and much troubled kingdom's while to invest a good round sum in such an experiment? Apart from all

right and wrong, high sense of duty and bitter after-taste of neglect,—would it not pay? But without simultaneous action the experiment cannot be made with any hope of appreciable effect. Even to retrieve and reform a single county where the anarchy of ruin now prevails, whole villages and hamlets must have the opportunity brought home to them—not by persuasion or driving—but simply by letting the alternative be plainly and honestly placed within their reach; and with patient faith in its efficacy, if not next week or next month, that eventually its intrinsic worth would be realised. Let a third-class emigrant ship under Government orders, and with Government responsibility for care in transit of each passenger, be advertised to sail on the first of each month from each western port for Canada or Australia; and empty or full let its foresail be spread to the wind; and before three months a bustling concourse of competitors for places in the floating cabin would be found at each point of departure, the only rule among which would be, first come first served. This is the true and the safe way to cleanse the full bosom of the perilous stuff that weighs upon the country's heart.

Third-class trains across the ocean; empty, half empty, or full, let them go. Like penny posts they might not everywhere pay at first: but they would all pay in the end. *Laissez faire* is the easiest and the cheapest rule of the markets for shirtings, bacon, pig-iron, brown middlings, and the discount on three months' bills; but *laissez faire* in cases of brain fever, half-famine—social convulsion—and moral dynamite in the ground story of one whole wing of empire, is the logic of idiocy. If you are up to your work the less time you waste in pottering and palavering about things finding their own level the better. Mere admonition, conciliatory, plausible, eloquent, is all to no purpose or something worse. 'There is no speculation in those eyes,' they are glazed and blinded by the perplexity of things, and there can no good come of waiting and gazing. It is time to be up and doing while happily there is still external peace, and freedom from foreign interruption or distraction. It is the time for gathering our colonial children together and drawing them closer by the bonds of mutual interest as well as affinity, and offering them ungrudged participation in all the honours and privileges of ancestral power and long-established strength; that when the evil day of foreign envy, jealousy, and revenge comes, as sooner or later it will, we may feel assurance that the seed of our loins will not be wanting for our help and stay. And to this end it is above all things desirable, nay, indispensable, that we multiply the unpurchasable bonds of mutual affection and benefit, with our three great groups of colonies. The Canadian Dominion craves more people to occupy and own its boundless wheat fields in the West. The younger Australias are ready to receive shiploads of healthful and capable settlers (and we ought to think of sending them no others); and all doubt and danger being now at an

end regarding New Zealand, there is in a less, but not unimportant degree, room and to spare for many a decade to come for sheep farming and all manner of agricultural trades and employments. It is mere captious cavilling to say that stimulated emigration, however successful for a time, cannot go on for ever. After some years the colonies might find they were getting more hands than they wanted, and we that we were having too few. Yes, and then the tonic would be dispensed with because the low fever had passed away. But our business is not with a dim and uncertain future; it is with the actual exigency of our own time, which we can thoroughly understand and deal with if common-sensically set about and mastered. Advantages for the purpose, of which our fathers never dreamed, which we ourselves can remember scientific discovery displaying as fanciful shades in a magic lantern, have fallen at our feet by the inscrutable mercy of Heaven; and what are we about if we fail to put forth our hand to take and be satisfied, to eat and be full?

Steam has bridged the ocean, and the telegraph has abolished space. Fine gentlemen and fair women in want of amusement spend more days on shipboard now for mere health or diversion than are required to carry husbandmen or artisans from the breeding grounds of penury to the pleasant places of independence and plenty. Once clear of our social congestion in particular parts of the realm, society may be expected to form anew healthfully and solvently; and if so, ten or twenty years hence it will need no specific appliances for the continued redistribution of its working population. But, if instead of this, we let the greedy and griping selfishness of *laissez faire* have its way, and look on while here and there the more daring prisoners of poverty jump the moat, and join on the other side their brethren who escaped before them, how can we wonder if, thinking of all they have left behind in anguish, insecurity, and squalor, they listen to the insidious promptings of bad men, and, out of the first savings of toil for unaccustomed wages, send their contributions to the privy purse of sedition, muttering literally, in the vulgar tongue of exile, the words of the malcontent of Venice?—

Cursed be your laws, and cursed your constitution,
The curse of growing factions blight your best endeavours.

The great line of railway from ocean to ocean, by which alone the British Colonies of America can be brought into the industrial union which now exists only on political maps and in magniloquent speeches, is at length in a fair way of being made. Before Christmas the Dominion Parliament was summoned, as the Viceroy explained, several weeks earlier than usual, 'as no action could be taken by contractors to prosecute the work, and no permanent arrangement for the organisation of systematic emigration from Europe to the north-west territory could be satisfactorily made until the policy of

Parliament with respect to the railway had been decided.' Three members of the Colonial Cabinet had visited England during the autumn, to make financial arrangements for the all-important work by means of a company, assisted by grants of money and land by the Colonial Government; and their efforts were so far successful that contracts had been entered into with a syndicate of well-known capitalists for the completion of this inestimable undertaking. It would indeed be strange, while the United States had constructed two lines of through traffic across the continent, and the venerable M. de Lesseps has begun cutting the Isthmus of Panama by joint-stock means, raised in France, if our engineering and monetary resources were found inadequate to execute a work more obviously called for by every consideration of commercial policy and imperial power. The paramount want of the New Country seems at this moment providentially to meet the importunate needs of the old realm.

To make the Canada Pacific line, thousands of rough hands eager for work with fair wages are required; and settlers to occupy the prairie grounds on either side of the length and track, to furnish the elements of traffic. On the other hand we are at our wits' end what to do with our small farmers in Connaught, who, though they got their holdings rent free, would never be safe to make a decent living out of them, and who in their despondency, too naturally wrought in their minds by a succession of bad harvests, have fallen into a state of desperation alike pitiable and perilous to themselves and the country at large. It does seem incomprehensible how impartial statesmen and philanthropists should hesitate to seize such an opportunity for lightening the old ship by manning the new craft that is advertising for crew and cargo. Seldom in the entanglements and contrarieties of national life has such an honourable and profitable way presented itself of solving a double difficulty. Nor is the transplantation of small farmers, in want of cheap and fruitful lands, to holdings, with fixity of tenure at nominal price, with freedom of sale, a mere stopgap for this year or next. Lord Lorne announced, in his speech already quoted, that two additional sections of the great line had been recently opened—one from Winnipeg to Portage la Prairie, the other from Cross Lake to Kee Wating—in all 264 miles. Rent-free allotments in perpetuity, varying in size, are filled up on either side by emigrants as fast as they offer to pay down one-tenth of the purchase money of 1*l.* an acre, acquiring thereby the right to obtain the remainder on the same terms as soon as they can. Wheat and other cereals of every kind grow without manure, and there is no forest to clear on taking possession. The new province of Manitoba, through which the Red River flows, is by all accounts declared to be the great granary of the future, that only awaits the opening of the railway to yield unexhaustible supplies to the cities

on both sides of the Atlantic; and the thousand miles of the projected line, with its countless fee-simple farms as golden fringe, will pass over its prolific bosom. During the gradual execution of the work, labour at weekly wages will be at the option of every active and thrifty settler in turn; and his turn is sure to be just at the time when he is most likely to want means in addition to those he has brought out with him, or can realise out of the produce of the first fields he tills. There is literally room enough and to spare for every family now eating its heart out in squabbles with landlordism at home, or in competing for the possession of a miserable scrap of inferior land not worth wasting life upon.

The rulers of Canada cannot indeed be expected to take over bodily unprovided crowds from Connaught whom disenchantment with dreams of peasant proprietorship, or disappointment of extravagant hopes from the Land Bill, may suddenly impel to take up their beds and walk the decks of the emigrant ship during this summer or next. A moving bog is a spectacle seldom seen, and one which few spectators ever desire to see again. If Imperial Government, moved at length into making some effectual effort to put an end to the consequences of too long neglect, should offer the transfer of any inordinate number of cottier and conacre folk from the affluents of the Shannon to those of the Saskatchewan, the Colonial Government would not consent to their wholesale establishment in particular places, for reasons which are too obvious for dispute. Excessive and indiscriminate aggregation is a blunder everywhere—nowhere more to be deprecated than in the foundation of new communities. The statesmen of the Dominion will understand that the strength of their growing country depends in no small degree upon the contributive character of the elements that compose it; and to its freedom thereby secured against its becoming a mere reproduction of any old country worsted in the race of European life; or what would be still worse, being made the new battle-ground of factions, each of them too weak to gain complete ascendancy, and each too strong in locally compact numbers to be subdued or assimilated. All these, however, do not deter enterprising men with sufficient resources to risk occasional loss and disappointment; but to the poorer sort they are matters requiring to be carefully weighed, and insured against in a reasonable degree. Even partial failure from causes capable of being foreseen would be just matter of reproach, and would be certain greatly to retard the future development of the Colony. The course of adventure and settlement from various quarters already heralds the way towards the north-west. In the graphic language of Sir A. Galt, ‘Settlers in Manitoba are already dotting the trail across the prairie to even more favoured regions, with their farms in every direction. Villages are springing up many hundreds of miles west of Winnipeg; churches are being built; mills to grind the future crop are having

their steam engines wearily dragged across the plains. By Act of the Dominion Parliament one-fourth of the whole public domain in the North-west territories is devoted absolutely to free grants to actual settlers, another fourth is held at their option for three years at one half the Government selling price, and the remaining one half is to be sold at prices varying from four shillings to one pound per acre. The free grant lands alone are nearly twice as extensive as the whole of England.¹

On the other hand, Mr. J. A. Blake, M.P., who has lately traversed the expectant region, gives warning of difficulties that require attentive consideration in order that they may be overcome. The Colonial Government has already granted much of the good land near the intended line of railway, to settlers or speculators, desiring to make a profit on its assignment; and the Hudson's Bay Company still retain immense tracts of the most desirable portions of the province; while without drainage other parts would prove unworkable for profit. During the brief and brilliant summer, mosquitoes are said to be a plague, and sometimes the 'grasshopper is a burthen.' Throughout the long winter scarcity and dearth of fuel will continue to be felt as a serious drawback until the railway is completed, save in those districts where natural wood abounds: and these are often far between. For settlement in the less occupied prairies, stretching from Manitoba to Columbia, Mr. Blake puts the cost of outfit, habitation, living, and first year's farming, a good deal higher than that which Mr. Tuke calculates as sufficient in the country of the Red River. Early frosts which injure materially unhoused corn, and prairie fires whose devastations are well known, must not be forgotten in the calculation of casualties. Mr. Tuke, indeed, is confident that an emigrant used to farming with a hundred pounds in hand and a family partly grown up to help him in the manifold tasks of a settler's life, may secure an allotment of 160 acres; and provided he is wise enough not to go out too early in the year, plough too deep, which does not answer, and be content with garden culture and a moderate sowing of corn for the first season, he may easily put up a snug shanty and offices before winter, and be ready for extended cultivation when the spring returns. As regards the actual pressure which Parliament is asked to relieve in Ireland, there are yet three months and more during which measures of help and encouragement may be matured, in time to enable an active and industrious man to migrate with the price of his tenant-right, or with the realised value of his crops or dairy produce during the present season. Nor are there wanting in Ulster and Leinster thrifty and keen tenants at will of absentee or spendthrift proprietors who, not knowing what is before them, and seeing no

¹ Paper read before the Colonial Institute, January 25, 1881.

provision available for their sturdy sons, might be induced with little argument and no coaxing to take themselves out of the agrarian trouble by which they are on all sides encompassed. Would it not be well worth while to throw the casting weight into every such wavering scale, were it only for the sake of the room it would afford and the abatement of ruinous competition it would cause? What signifies the loss, even if it be an ultimate loss, of the whole cost of transit, for such a man and his family to the central prairie of Canada, and of the office fees and charge for title of his farm there, if he lodges pound for pound before starting, as the best of pledges that he is no pauper or ne'er-do-weel, and therefore no unfit or undeserving colonist?

Of course it will be said, why should the imperial treasury be asked to help men who, if left to themselves, may possibly find their way out next year or the year after? As well might it be said, why run the risk of cold or getting wet by helping to put out a neighbouring fire when perhaps it may burn out of itself? A great country cannot afford a parsimonious rule of economy. When misfortunes come, no matter whence or how, the wisest and best course is to meet them by any means which does not throw the burthen on particular classes or districts to the exoneration of the rest of the community; not because public money ought to be spent lavishly on undeserving objects, but because the benefit done exceptionally to persons who have no individual claim is often a great and solid benefit to the whole realm. We pay millions annually to keen-witted contractors for building us floating towers of hideous aspect and of murderous might; and, if no naval war ensues, nobody gains by the outlay but those who design and equip our ironclads. But if the fact that we have not shrunk from the cost averts a naval war, have we not after all the best of the bargain? Far more so if by a temporary and limited expenditure we help to quench the hazard of a servile war, and at the same time help to strengthen and ensure a noble appanage of empire that yearns for such reinforcement? The colonies do not always need or bid for the same sort of settlers; and we are bound at all times to have regard to their feelings in this respect, and even to their passing prejudices. New Zealand, for example, is said just now to be disposed to deprecate any stimulation of the ordinary movement thither, which has been somewhat checked from causes which need not be examined here. Then be it so, and let us not incur for a moment the reproach of trying to shift a portion of our burthen upon her. Ten years ago, when the standing garrison was recalled before the Maories had finally subsided into peaceful neighbourship, the Home Government was urged to advance a million sterling to encourage emigration; and at first the accommodation was refused. But appeals in Parliament and in the press on behalf of New Zealand after a while prevailed; and no one in his senses would say now that Lord Granville (then Colonial Secretary) committed a

mistake in yielding, although in the change of times another decade finds New Zealand in a different case, and in another mood. There is one rule, however, which never seems to vary. No colony will submit patiently to be saddled with a worn-out, sickly, or pauperised crowd, who cannot get work in our towns, or make a living by agriculture here. British colonists have not quitted home in former years, and spent their prime amid the perils and privations of the wilderness, to have their evening spoiled and the morning of their children overcast by the penury and misery our negligence has suffered to accumulate in our great towns or forlorn seaboard. It is no use arguing about the matter. The colonies have now local self-government, magnetic intelligence, and a free press; and they won't be put upon in this way. If, therefore, we invite them to contribute towards the acceleration of a transfer of residence, whether urban or agricultural, it must be conditional on the artisan or husbandman giving some proof that he is worth helping. And this was the reason why the advocates of assisted emigration in a former parliament fearlessly provoked the shortsighted objection of those who penuriously pleaded that the central treasury ought not to contribute in passage money or settlement fees, for persons who might possibly manage to do without it. But there is no reason why various classes of agriculturists should not have the benefit of the contributory system. In our children's colonial house there are many mansions, and room for many small as well as large denizens; and if the system of associated emigration of neighbours and relatives from the same locality were once recognised and organised on a proper footing, there is no cause to doubt that the authorities of Manitoba or of Australia would adapt their regulations so as to accommodate, at all events by way of experiment, the sort of families who would be most willing probably to move from Ireland at the present time. The example of what has been done in the contiguous States of the Union to provide comfortable, though humble, homes for people of this description, cannot have been lost on the emulous authorities on the northern side of the border. With a paramount aim of getting the great Dominion railway completed as rapidly as possible Canada will not throw difficulties in the way, we may be sure, of replanting each side of the line with stout and active settlers, though some bring thither less ready money than others of their countrymen are able to do.

Left to itself the efflux of population drifts naturally in the easiest channels, no general thought being apparently taken of consequences to the empire, immediate or essential. Of 41,296 who quitted Ireland in 1879, no less than 30,058 went to the United States; while only 8,198 sought homes in the Polynesian group, and but 2,317 in Canada. I have reason to believe that the returns for 1880 will prove still more suggestive; showing that in the past year 166,570 persons

of British or Irish birth emigrated to the United States, and 60,972 to other places. What a commentary on the doctrine of leaving everything to find its own level! Our nearest and greatest sister realms beyond sea which lack population the most for every purpose, and which for every reason we should most earnestly desire to see replenished with men of our own race, are stinted and starved, while our jealous rivals in manufactures and trade absorb seventy-two per cent. of the whole.²

The ascendancy of the working classes in Victoria, since the concession of universal suffrage, and their persuasion that profitable manufactures and trades of every kind can be best promoted by rigorously limiting the competition of sea-borne goods and hands, has for some years practically caused Melbourne to be omitted in the calculations of intending emigrants. The nobler policy of New South Wales has, on the other hand, adhered steadily to the principles of free trade and free competition in labour; and Sydney welcomes to her splendid and ever-growing marts the products of European and American industry, and the willing worker from every clime and realm, and of every race and creed. There are already settled in this most hospitable and happy State a considerable number of Irish by descent or birth, who assimilate well with other portions of the population, and unnoticeably contribute to that social fusion; it is the best antidote to any recurrence of the political confusion and conflict that still afflict their mother-land. The Legislature, though democratically chosen, has never shown the jealousy betrayed by her ambitious neighbour and rival in the disposal of land or the employment of skill. From time to time considerable assistance has been offered to the better class of emigrants from the old country in order to keep pace with growing wants and new developments of industry. Whether these inducements will continue to be held out, having regard to the facilities which exist for a constant immigration from China, time alone can tell. But there are younger States on the Southern Main which still need aids to colonisation, and which, if liberally and wisely dealt with by the Imperial Government, would doubtless see their advantage in accelerating the advent of new settlers from Ulster, if not from Connaught. If the atmosphere is not as humid or the weather as variable as that of Ireland, fevers, coughs, and rheumatic affections are proportionately rare; and as farms of every size, from twenty to eighty acres and upwards, are to be had in perpetuity under the excellent laws of simple transfer and sale originally devised by the late member for Cambridge, when Minister for South Australia, at less than one year's rent at home, the opportunity seems to be within our reach for settling half the perplexities of the land question in Ireland.

W. M. TORRENS.

² *Emigration Returns, by Board of Trade, February 10, 1880.*

THE BASUTOS AND SIR BARTLE FRERE.

‘The circumstances under which the Basutos became subjects of the Crown are peculiar, and impose upon Her Majesty’s Government a special responsibility for their welfare.’—*The Earl of Kimberley.*

THE history of the Basutos has certainly been a sad one. As to that there will be no dispute. They had a time of rapid improvement and much prosperity, and now they are being driven back into barbarism by men who call themselves civilised. They asked for the means of developing their nation in security under the Government of the Queen, and so long as faith was kept with them they prospered. They showed a most loyal and friendly feeling towards the Queen and the Government, even during the deepest crisis of the Zulu war, and their reward is that they are being massacred by white troops, because they are said to be in ‘rebellion’ against the same Government. It is a remarkable change, and its causes are well worth considering.

In the January number of this Review there is an article by the late Governor of the Cape, which sets forth the history of this simple people in terms so misleading, that I am desirous to call attention to the real facts of this sad story—a story, as I think, rarely surpassed in the gloomy annals of misrule.

It is needless to refer to the obscure history of the formation of this tribe. Suffice it to say that, after many disputes with their neighbours, in 1869 they requested Sir P. Wodehouse to accept them as subjects of the Crown. He did this, he tells us (*Times*, December 23, 1880), after ‘a full and free discussion with all the leading members of the tribe,’ and he adds that ‘it was distinctly agreed that they should not form part of the Cape Colony, but that British authority should be exercised over them by the Governor of the Cape in his capacity of High Commissioner.’

The next date is 1871, when, under Sir H. Barkly, the Basutos were annexed to the Cape Colony, but, as Sir P. Wodehouse believes, ‘without consultation with the tribe.’

By the Act of 1871 it was provided that the power of making, repealing, amending and altering laws and regulations for the Government of Basutoland should be vested in the Governor, and

no Acts of the Cape Parliament could be extended to the Basutos, unless they were expressly named in the Acts, or unless the Governor issued a proclamation or notice to extend or apply the Act to their territory. If the Governor should do this, he must lay the laws and regulations so proclaimed, before Parliament within fourteen days of its assembling.

It is, I think, pretty clear that, whatever the change thus made might involve, the Basuto chiefs understood that something had happened bringing them into close relations with the Cape Colony, for in the early months of 1872 they presented a petition to Sir H. Barkly asking for representation in the Cape Parliament.

The reply of the Governor is very remarkable. He reminds them that, if their request were granted, they would lose their peculiar privileges, and would 'be placed in a similar position to the ordinary Kaffir population.' Their own customs would be superseded by Colonial laws. Europeans would be allowed to acquire land and settle in their territory, and they would lose other privileges, as the exclusion of spirituous liquor, from their country.

The next great event was the conferring of responsible Government on the Cape Colony. This has altered the position of the Basutos; for the present war would probably have been impossible under the former condition of things. But it seems clear that, however important the change may have been, it was made without any proclamation to the Basutos, who assert—and this is confirmed by M. Mabille—that they did not understand what had happened till 1879. Lord Kimberley seems to assume that this was so in his recent instructions to Sir Hercules Robinson. But, as he observes, the powers of the Governor are 'technically unaltered.' There is, however, a most important distinction, to which the Basutos seem to be now alive. The Governor has now to take the advice on these matters of his ministers, who are dependent for their power on the Colonial Parliament, whereas before the Act of 1872, the Governor was responsible to the Minister of the Crown, and the Parliament of England really governed Basutoland. Surely Sir P. Wodehouse may be believed when he says, 'It was by these operations and by these alone, and not by their choice, that the Basutos were cut off from the immediate protection of the Home Government.'

It is of course not very easy to be positive as to what was said and done by every one concerned in affairs so complicated, and where we are speaking of men not accustomed to all the nice distinctions of government by Crown or by Colony with which we are familiar, but it seems very clear that these simple people looked to the Governor and not to the Cape Parliament, where they were not represented, and that they had a kind of guarantee from Sir H. Barkly, that if they remained satisfied with their former status, they would retain all their peculiar privileges, would keep 'Basutoland for the Basutos,

would exclude intoxicating liquors from their people, and would otherwise be independent so long as they were loyal. Representation was refused, and they fell back, as they supposed, on the old condition of things.

But the deed is done and cannot at present be undone. The Colonists have the right to make this war, and they ask at present no aid from England.

The next period in the history of the Basutos is one of continued and remarkable prosperity. It would seem that no tribe in South Africa has ever made such rapid progress in all respects. This is admitted by Sir Bartle Frere, but he uses this fact as an argument in favour of disarmament, because, as he suggests, a tribe which has become so rich in cattle and horses and grain, and is at the same time armed with guns, is far more dangerous than when, though less advanced towards civilisation, they were comparatively poor. He treats them as still barbarous, though they build houses and churches and schools, for he asserts that the contest for disarmament is a contest between civilisation and 'barbarism.' Such is not the opinion of those who have lived amongst them. The French missionaries insist strongly on the progress towards peaceful habits which has been made by their converts, and by the whole tribe. It would seem natural to suppose that men who have so much to lose would be more disposed to peace than when they were so much less provided with the comforts and luxuries of life.¹ But Sir Bartle seems to see a possible enemy in every black man, and the more he possesses the more dangerous he becomes in his eyes. What says Colonel Griffith, the Governor's Agent, who has so long and so ably served the Cape Government in Basutoland? Referring to the alienation of Morosi's land to which he strongly objected, he says: 'Instead of having as at present a contented, happy, and confiding people to deal with, we shall have the very reverse—we shall have a discontented lot, who will be always thinking and pondering over their grievances.' This letter is dated the 27th of November, 1879, and is very prophetic in its tone (C. 2569, p. 34). Sir Bartle Frere himself (C. 2569, p. 7) under date of the 2nd of March, 1880, says: 'They are a very intelligent people, with many excellent special national characteristics, such as industry and frugality;' but, as he adds, they have weaknesses which he thinks characteristic of native races, 'inordinate vanity and a sense of self-importance.' One need not go far from Westminster to find many examples of such

¹ Compare the words of the Committee of the Paris Missionary Society in Paper C. 2569, p. 5:—'We can bear to the Basutos the testimony that, owing to the teaching of the Gospel, and *their daily increasing taste for civilisation*, they became more and more averse to everything resembling war. The very men who may now consider the disarmament as an insult and a threat, suffered their guns to rust in a corner. It would be lamentable to see a people so peacefully inclined, so promising, subjected to a treatment by which they might be led to acts which result in the shedding of blood.'

weaknesses. He blames them for suspicion and distrust of the Cape Government. This is easily explained by the fact of their persistent conviction that they were and always have been direct subjects of the Queen. But vanity or even suspicion is a poor reason for disarming a loyal and industrious people.

It is not perhaps necessary to say more as to the condition of the people when these disputes arose. But the following words from the *Cape Argus* of the 12th of July, 1880, are, I think, worth quoting:—

The people at home know that in the Basutos we are confronted by no wretched, besotted, savage race, living precariously upon hunter's garbage and barbarian food; but a serious and intelligently industrious people thickly populating a fertile land, quick in agriculture, commercially acquisitive, careful herdsmen, making the best of their country, educating their children in schools, and purchasing largely goods of European and colonial manufacture.

During the Zulu troubles the Basutos were most loyal. Members of their tribe fought most bravely on our side at Isandlwana, and Mr. Sprigg (C. 2569, p. 42) acknowledges their perfect loyalty until the outbreak of Morosi—a petty chieftain, of mixed blood, not a true Basuto—who had always been of dubious loyalty even to his native chief, Moshesh. Letsie, the chief of the tribe, at once assisted to put down Morosi, and Mr. Sprigg acknowledges, ‘with pleasure,’ the services of 2,000 Basutos, ‘in putting down the rebellion.’ He also acknowledges the efforts of Letsie ‘to bring Morosi to a sense of his duty.’ It should be observed in passing that, on this occasion at any rate, the arms of the Basutos were found useful to the Government, and these 2,000 men would have been of little use had they been previously disarmed.²

Notwithstanding these events, Mr. Sprigg attended the ‘Pitso’ of the Basutos in 1879, and there informed the tribe that they would have to surrender their arms. The chiefs protested, but in vain. The Minister was firm. Accordingly, in January 1880, the chief and people through Letsie presented a petition to the Governor, which is certainly a most pathetic document, though Sir Bartle Frere makes light of it in his despatches. They do not refuse to give up their arms, and to this hour Letsie has remained loyal and has kept many of his tribe with him. But they state how much this proceeding

² Compare the following from the *Daily News* of the 21st of January, 1881:—

THE WAR AND THE FINGOES.—A Correspondent writing from Mbulu, in Fingo-land, says:—‘Hundreds of our people (the Fingoes) are off for the war. My heart was sore to see them going away to meet an armed force, many of them with only knobkeeries and sticks, and most of them with only one assegai. Their own hearts were low. “Why,” they said, “did Government take away our arms, burn them, and tell us that we would be protected, and now when many of our friends have been robbed of their all and many also killed, we are called upon to defend ourselves with these sticks, whilst our enemies have guns? We cannot trust Government any more.”’

grieves them, as undeserved and disgraceful. They narrate the history of their loyalty, and they say—

We pray you will favourably consider the tears of your servants, and on account of your high position, may you be willing to grant us our prayer. . . . Hitherto we have been known first as the faithful friends and allies of the Queen, and then as her faithful subjects. Up to the Zambesi and down to Cape Town we are known as such—we are named the children of the Queen. If we are disarmed, will not other tribes say that we have offended against the Government?

I do not believe that there is a word of exaggeration in this document. The statements are true, and are admitted. But it is replied by Sir Bartle Frere and his Ministers that it is intolerable to have so many native men in our territories who are possessed of arms. They have decided to disarm other native tribes, and the same law must apply to the Basutos. What can they want arms for, it is asked. The game is gone, and the enemies are gone. They must have intentions they do not divulge, or they would not cling to their arms so stubbornly. Sir Bartle is fond of comparing these people to children. It is astonishing that he does not see that children cling to what gives ornament or fancied dignity when they have no evil designs. And even civilised men are fond of military display when they are most peacefully disposed. I have sat at the hospitable board of Mr. Speaker, surrounded by civilians in military costume, which they wear as a mark of personal dignity, although they are, above all things, guardians of the public peace. Can we, then, be so much surprised if simple and ignorant natives cling to arms which they have purchased by hard work, and which are supposed to lend some dignity to them as men—to say nothing of their use for purposes of sport or defence?

Of course we all admit that it would be well to have the same population labouring peacefully and without arms, but surely we ask too much from people so recently civilised when we demand from them so great a sacrifice, and a sudden abandonment of those means of defence to which they have been ever accustomed. It is most unfair to assume that they mean mischief because, being accustomed to possess arms, they desire to continue to do so even after they have begun to appreciate civilised life. So we see that Sir G. Wolseley, fully alive to the danger that may arise from the possession of arms by an active and excitable people, yet insists that the dangers of disarmament are far greater than the danger incident to a policy of confidence in native loyalty. His despatch of the 10th of March, 1880 (C. 2569, p. 36) is a conclusive answer to Sir Bartle Frere's lengthened warnings. He refuses to be frightened out of his senses. He warns Government of the danger, and he uses these most remarkable words:—

That we have never had any general rising of the natives against the white man in South Africa is, I believe, because we have never yet adopted any line of policy

that was calculated to unite them generally against us. . . . With a people who may be said to have no fixed ideas of religion, it is difficult to conceive any question of dispute arising unless we ignored all regard to justice, which would be of a nature to make itself felt by all tribes, and so possibly unite them in one common band against us—except this question of disarmament.³

Sir Garnet says he writes this without knowing Sir Bartle Frere's views. There is no evidence that he has changed his mind.

I do not think any perusal of Sir Bartle's views would have changed the sentiments of Sir Garnet. It is astonishing how easily an able man may deceive himself in order to confirm himself in any line he may have taken up. Sir Bartle now falls back on the history of the present war as conclusive proof of the treasonable designs of the Basutos. In other words, having driven many of them, by his demands, to resistance, he assumes that they always intended to rebel on the first opportunity. It is difficult patiently to consider such an argument. One might as well say if one should get into a quarrel with a neighbour by reason of an insult of one's own making, that one always knew he meant mischief, because one never liked the looks of him. There is one satisfaction in the use of this argument by Sir Bartle. It makes one feel as if he was pushed very hard for evidence, when he can condescend to such an argument. No doubt he considers that it was the duty of the whole tribe to follow Letsie, and surrender their arms at once on receiving orders. The same argument would put an end to all resistance to authority under all circumstances. It is an old weapon now grown rather rusty, and less likely to be useful in England than anywhere else, seeing that Englishmen, though very obedient to law, have shown over and over again that they know how to resent and to resist oppression, whether enforced under the forms of law, or attempted without the sanction of law. I think that most of Sir Bartle's countrymen will be rather disposed to admire the patience of Letsie and his followers than to wonder at the active resistance offered by the rest of the tribe.

It is natural to observe here how perplexed the natives must be by our action as to arms. At one time we encourage them to buy, and then we force them to disarm. To use the words of Dr. Moffat, 'The Government allows its merchants in town and country to sell firearms to the native tribes to any amount, and gives licence to traders to go far and near to sell and barter with firearms. . . . By-and-by John Bull prepares a proclamation and it goes forth, that all those over whom he has power are to be disarmed—that is, deprived of the property for which they have honourably, and in some cases enormously, paid.' Sir Bartle in reply to this (C. 2676, p. 43) says

³ A most remarkable confirmation of Sir Garnet's opinion is to be found in the last Blue Book (C. 2755: 1881). Major-General Sir H. Clifford, Administrator at Cape Town, writing to Lord Kimberley, under date the 20th of September, 1880, after the disturbances had commenced, recommends that no Imperial troops be allowed to take part, and he goes on, 'I am of opinion that it was not necessary to disarm the Basutos' (p. 169).

that he has always set his face against these proceedings. That may be sufficient to preserve his consistency, but it does not remove the difficulty which arises from the inconsistency of the Government, for the purchase and sale of firearms was strictly legal, and a native who has never used them, except to aid us, may well wonder what has occurred to justify such a sudden change, and such a wholesale discredit of peaceable citizens.

The more carefully we analyse the arguments of Sir Bartle Frere, the more clear it is that they all resolve themselves into one—that of fear. He has adopted a scare which he cannot get rid of, and, having committed himself to this impulse, he is driven forward to lengths never probably anticipated by himself. Writing on the 17th of April, 1880, Mr. Ayliff, 'Secretary for Native Affairs' (C. 2676, p. 45), says that his Government are unwilling to believe that the enforcement of this law would drive even a part of the Basutos into rebellion. And it is clear that, even long after this date, the Government were comforting themselves with a hope that all would go well. They exaggerated their own power and disparaged the courage of a brave people, and we see the result.

Sir Bartle lays very much stress on the changed position of the Colony as a ground for increased alarm as to the designs and power of the natives. Formerly the Colony could fall back on England. Now the small force at the Cape is not at the beck and call of the Governor for Colonial purposes. Sir Garnet Wolseley refused to be alarmed when the Pondos seemed to be disturbed, and referred Sir Bartle to the police. So Sir Bartle refuses to be comforted. He must be on the safe side, and must get hold of these arms at any risk. This policy of the English Government is nothing very new. For ten years past it has been announced and acted on with more or less consistency. Assuming the natives to have evil designs, the danger of the Colonists is of course enhanced, and they have organised themselves accordingly. But if I am right as to the meaning and intentions of the Basutos, there was no serious danger in remaining as you were, and a most serious risk in attempting an undeserved disarmament, so that Sir Bartle, knowing his reserve force to be gone, has rushed madly into danger. Probably his Ministers thought 'England will help us if we are in any real trouble,' and this made them venturous. But they were warned by the present and by the late Secretary of State that they must not depend on England—that England did not see the need of these measures, and would not fly to the rescue. They have not heeded this warning, and finding now the evil consequences of their rashness, they seek to defend themselves by assuming that England is indifferent to their fate, and that therefore they must defend themselves as best they may, by any means at their disposal, however harsh and irritating to the natives. England is not indifferent, but she objects to being dragged into such wars

against her will, and she is not disposed to help those who do not know how to help themselves by wise conduct.

Sir Bartle is very anxious for the gradual fusion of the races, 'social and political,' and in this all will agree with him. But surely in order to effect this fusion there must be something like mutual confidence. Sir Bartle's paper shows that he has no confidence in the natives, or, if he has, that he has an odd way of showing it, and I cannot help thinking that no man has done so much to destroy all chance of any confidence of the natives in white men as the chief author and supporter of the Zulu and Basuto wars. His conduct is consistent, I admit. He does not trust the native, and he shows his want of trust by his acts, but he expects the ignorant native to develop a perfect confidence in the white man. He pleads that the situation is complicated, and that people on the spot must know far more about what ought to be done than even a Secretary of State, too often badgered as he is by philanthropists. That is true, but the people of the Cape Colony are, many of them, hostile to Sir Bartle's policy, and the Crown has not lost its *sovereignty* over the Colony, as he admits. It has not, therefore, lost its *responsibility*, and the Parliament of England, as the sovereign power, is bound to consider these grave matters, and if injustice is being or has been done, it is also bound, not merely to express an opinion, but also to use every possible effort to secure a change of policy, and the restoration of right and justice to men of every race under its sway.

There are some omissions in Sir Bartle Frere's argument which deserve special attention in considering its value.

(1.) He makes allusion to the Morosi rebellion, and is disposed to fasten on the tribe a serious responsibility for his acts, although he admits that his allegiance to Letsie was only 'nominal.' He even goes so far as to hint that the conduct of Morosi was one of the principal causes of the disarmament. But he never alludes to the fact, so freely acknowledged by his Government, that Letsie and 2,000 men of his tribe assisted the Cape government in quelling Morosi's rebellion. Such an omission is certainly not generous, for the conduct of Letsie was strong evidence of loyalty, and if the conduct of Morosi was adduced on one side, that of Letsie ought not to have been forgotten.

(2.) There is something more than an omission as to the Chief Letsie. No one has yet denied that this man has behaved with as much loyalty as dignity in his relations to the Cape Government. He has surrendered his arms, and has sought to persuade his people to do the same; but Sir Bartle (p. 193) hints that his abandonment of the stronghold of Thaba Bosigo since the commencement of the war may have resulted from treachery, and not from necessity. He gives no evidence to support this insinuation. He omits to give credit to Letsie for his good conduct, and he seems quite ready to believe him

capable of treachery, without offering any reason. Had any one treated Mr. Sprigg in this fashion, Sir Bartle would have been the first to vindicate his reputation. It would seem that Letsie was right—the black man must be in the wrong, and his fault of colour proves him capable of any kind of moral obliquity.

It must of course be admitted that in the recent correspondence Colonel Griffith and others accuse Letsie of weakness, but it seems to me that they hardly make enough allowance for the difficulty and danger of his position, and at any rate there is, so far as I can see, nothing to justify the harsh insinuations in this article to which I have referred.

It ought to be added that, when the critical moment arrived, Letsie was not supported by the Government as he should have been. As early as the 29th of April 1880, Mr. C. H. Bell, one of the resident magistrates, warned the Government that the people preferred waiting for orders from their chiefs, to obeying orders from the Government, so long as that Government had no force in the country, because they feared the risk of having their families murdered, and their cattle captured, if they abandoned their arms (Cape Blue Book, A. 12 : 1880). In fact, the Government rushed unprepared into the war, and so aggravated their difficulties, by giving no visible sign of an intention to protect loyal natives. As Sir H. Clifford puts it (C. 2755, p. 169), ‘When the order was given to the Basutos to surrender their arms, arrangements at the same time should have been made to protect those who immediately complied with the order from those who would not.’

(3.) I think Sir Bartle is guilty of an omission as to Mr. Sprigg, but it is in the other direction. He praises him for his temper, prudence, and humanity, but he seems to have forgotten all about the Vagrancy Acts and the Pass Acts, which seem to the ordinary Englishman to be neither prudent nor humane. But probably Sir Bartle thinks such proceedings necessary in dealing with black men, and therefore justifiable, and certainly if the conduct of Government as to this war be humane, there is not much to be said as to former acts; but I object to our judgment as to recent proceedings being clouded by reference to the character of any one, unless we have it set before us more fully and clearly than in general phrases which may mean much or little according to the bias of the writer. The evidence would seem to show that Mr. Sprigg has always been an advocate of stern repression of the coloured race, and as such he is consistent in his present course; but it is too much to ask us to credit him with great humanity, when we see such misery and desolation resulting from his measures.

There can be no question that the Vagrancy Law has caused terrible suffering to perfectly innocent people with black skins. It is certainly not a ‘humane’ law, whatever else may be said about it.

A minister of the Presbyterian Free Church at Umgwali was, less than a year ago, arrested for travelling without a pass, and had to spend the night in the common prison, when he was merely on his way to attend a meeting of the Presbytery. The arrest was, I suppose, legal, but it was as harsh as it was absurd.

About two years ago occurred the Koegas massacre and that of the Korannas, both of which made no small stir at the time, and would seem to show that the Government of the Cape is far from humane. It cannot be a cause of surprise if many natives should shrink from coming under the absolute control of white men, so regardless of justice to the black race as in these cases officials of the Government were proved to be. The less said about humanity the better. Some would, I suppose, say that inhumanity to black men is unavoidable. At any rate it is best to call things by their right names.⁴

(4.) Another most serious omission occurs with reference to Colonel Griffith. Sir Bartle asserts that the Colonel acquiesced in each step of the Cape Government and advised an appeal to force before the Government did anything. The reader is left under the impression that the Colonel is a thorough supporter of the policy of the Cape Government as to Basutoland. But the fact is that the Colonel has expressed himself most favourably towards the tribe, and when it was proposed by Sir Bartle Frere to confiscate the land of Morosi, and treat it as no longer part of their territory, he wrote a most firm

⁴ In confirmation of what I have said as to the administration of the law, I quote a few words from the address of Mr. J. A. Froude to Lord Kimberley in introducing a deputation on the 27th of May, last year. Referring to these two measures, he says:—‘An inquiry was ordered, and at last, after various delays—not, however, till nearly a year had passed—the Cape Government undertook a prosecution, and a judge came down to Victoria West to try the farmers for murder. It was known that at Victoria West, among their own relations, there was not the slightest prospect of a verdict against them. The prosecuting barrister himself telegraphed, before the trial, to the Attorney-General to tell him so, and to beg that the case might be removed to the Supreme Court in Cape Town. The Attorney-General ordered him to go on where he was. The Koegas case was tried first. The prisoners were indicted for the murder of the six women and children on the march. They were distinctly proved to have shot them; but the Attorney-General had neglected to produce the formal proof that they had been killed, and the result, as had been expected, was an acquittal. The escort who had shot the five men were to be tried the next day. The prosecuting barrister again telegraphed to the Attorney-General, telling him what had happened, and again begging that the second trial might be held elsewhere. Again the Attorney-General instructed him to go on, and again with the same result. The murderers were acquitted. When the verdict was given in, the whole court rose and cheered, and one of the jury openly said that all Korannas ought to be shot. Such is justice at this moment in the Cape Colony, and it is to be remembered that these field-cornets held commissions under the Colonial Government, and were acting in the Queen’s name and under the British flag. But the story is not yet over. The editor of the *Argus* newspaper, which has always bravely defended the native interests, published an indignant article, reflecting justly and sternly on the Attorney-General’s conduct. The Attorney-General prosecuted him for a libel, demanding ten thousand pounds damages. The damages given were small, scarcely more than nominal, but they carried costs, and the editor or proprietor of the paper had to pay several hundred pounds.’

remonstrance which had great weight with Lord Kimberley, and he has always been most anxious to maintain friendly relations with the Basuto chiefs. A few words from this letter, dated the 27th of November, 1879, are worth quoting (C. 2569, p. 34):—‘I fail to see why the Basutos who have staunchly supported us should be punished for the acts of the rebel chief Morosi and his followers who have paid the penalty of their crime with their lives. . . . The Basutos will at once conclude that this is only the thin end of the wedge, and that upon one pretence or another they will eventually be deprived of all their country.’ More than this, in a letter dated the 26th of January, 1880, addressed to the Secretary for Native Affairs, he mentions four measures, and amongst them disarmament, as likely to cause disaffection; and he says, ‘I cannot but feel that I have been placed in an equivocal position;’ and again, ‘I am loth to run the risk of losing this hard-won reputation without raising one warning note.’ It is certainly most strange that the actual opinions of Colonel Griffith should have been thus concealed from his readers by Sir Bartle.

It is proper to add, though Sir Bartle does not mention it, that Colonel Griffith’s view was entirely approved by Lord Kimberley, who in his despatch of the 20th of May, 1880 (Blue Book, p. 49), expresses very strongly his wish that the land of Morosi should be kept for the Basutos, and not handed over for sale to natives and whites without discrimination—so breaking the compact made, as he insists, that Basutoland should be for the Basutos.

I have thus endeavoured to state the case of the Basutos as it strikes Englishmen who try to look at it without prejudice and who merely desire the welfare of all parts of our dominions. I never met Sir Bartle Frere. I have judged his public conduct as set forth in public documents open to all the world. If he had allowed the case to rest on those documents, I dare say others would have done the same. But he has not done so. He has sought to vindicate his conduct in an elaborate article. It is, I think, natural that those who differ from him should endeavour to frame a reply. I have desired in these pages to make allowance for the difficulties of his position. But in reviewing his conduct it is of no use to conceal one’s sentiments and to use mild phrases when one feels a strong disapproval. The case is now before the world, and before Parliament. Sir Bartle has evidently satisfied his own conscience as a man. He has done his best. It is for others to judge whether he has done well.

WILLIAM FOWLER.

LONG AND SHORT SERVICE.

GREAT misconception exists in the minds of the public as to the real meaning of 'short service,' and as to its effect upon the present condition of our army. This ignorance is even very largely shared by the army, many of whose older members, with that unquestioning courage for which the British veteran has always been distinguished, condemn it without understanding either the reasons that begot it or the objects it was intended to secure. I think it may be safely asserted that a large proportion of those who are loudest in condemning it have never read the parliamentary papers in which its provisions are explained, or the speeches in which Mr. Cardwell and his colleagues explained the Enlistment Act of 1870. It is the same with the localisation scheme: how few comprehend its provisions, or have taken the trouble to study the Reports of the Committee on the Organisation of the Military Forces of the country, dated 1872-73. Were it possible to collect information on the subject, how interesting and instructive it would be to furnish Parliament with a return showing what proportion of those, who in the military clubs are loudest in denouncing the present army system, have ever read the Report of the Militia Committee of 1876, of which Colonel Stanley—the late able Secretary of State for War—was president. How few of our older officers are aware that our new army organisation is based upon the proposals contained in a very remarkable memorandum by his Royal Highness the Field-marshal Commanding-in-chief, written in 1871, which was presented to Parliament in 1872. Every ailment from which our army, in common with all armies, periodically suffers, is attributed to the recent reforms effected in our military organisation, it being entirely forgotten that those reforms have been based upon the valuable suggestions contained in the above-mentioned memorandum of his Royal Highness the Duke of Cambridge.

Those unacquainted with our army and the habits and mode of thought of our officers, especially of those of the old school, may very naturally inquire how this comes about: why is it that men who are honest, truthful, straightforward, and loyal in the very highest acceptance of those terms, many of them of considerable experience in public affairs, all of whom have seen a great deal of the world, and have received the average education of the ordinary English gentleman—why should they be prejudiced in an unreasoning manner, and

combine to condemn a system of which a large proportion of them know so little? To the civilian mind this may be difficult to understand; but to the man who has himself spent a quarter of a century in camp and quarters surrounded by all those subtle influences which imperceptibly discipline the officer's mind without his being conscious of the process going on in it, this fact requires no proof. When I joined as an ensign in 1852, I heard the same complaints then that are to be heard daily in our clubs now, as to the deterioration of the army; that neither officers nor men were as good as they had been in previous epochs of our military history, and that all the reforms that had then been recently effected in the law of enlistment, abolishing enlistment for life and for twenty-one years, and establishing ten and twelve years as the terms for which our infantry and cavalry were thenceforward to be respectively engaged, were in themselves essentially bad, and must eventually ruin the army. The symptoms that mark this military disease of chronic grumbling, of whining pessimism, are the same, yesterday, to-day, and will be so for ever, in the same way that the arguments used in Parliament in 1847 by the old generals, who then opposed with all their power and influence the Short Service Act of that year, are almost identical word for word with those in which the recently effected reforms have been and are still denounced. There is a certain class of officer who seems to believe that the world, as far as armies and military science are concerned, stands still; they see around them the most marvellous changes effected by steam, electricity, and mechanical inventions, and they accept them as a matter of course, ignoring or unconscious of the fact that all such discoveries and inventions react upon armies and military science, and that, as education and the intelligence which is its grandchild spread through the social strata from which we obtain our recruits, we are obliged to treat them in a different manner from that in which we dealt with their illiterate and stupid forefathers. The private soldier of the last century, and even during our great struggle with Napoleon, was treated by us in an almost brutal manner; we dealt with him as if he were an unreasoning mechanism which, for very contrariness sake, went frequently out of order. We caught him as a sort of wild man, and, instead of endeavouring to raise him in the scale of humanity, we brutalised him by treating him as an unreasoning being. Those who would still wish to flog the soldier as the keeper does his wilful spaniel, who are never tired of reminding us of the glories achieved by our troops under Wellington, and of referring to that army that 'could do anything and march anywhere,' forget the atrocious and fiendish horrors of Badajos and of Ciudad Rodrigo; there is much ado because an occasional henroost may be robbed nowadays on the line of march during operations in the field, whilst all remembrance of the scenes of indiscipline during Moore's retreat to Corunna, or the great Duke's retreat to Lisbon, are entirely for-

gotten or ignored. There is a great deal of talk of the good old times, and of their glories, and of the imagined magnificence of our soldiers then, of their splendid physical appearance, and of their high moral qualities of discipline, &c. ; we are daily treated to comparisons in heroic language between the soldier of to-day and the soldier of the beginning of this century: the murders, and the robberies, and the drunkenness of the soldiers of eighty and a hundred years ago are forgotten, and we remember only their splendid achievements. In those days, as at present, splendid success was only secured when really able and scientific generals commanded in the field; and then, as now, when incompetence directed our military operations, failure and disgraceful disaster were the result. It should never be forgotten that our army that won Waterloo was pronounced by its great commander to be the worst he had ever commanded; whilst I think it will be freely admitted by the student of military history, that the physique and discipline of the little armies which are now only remembered by reason of the misfortunes and calamities that overtook them, were often of the very highest order. It was the character and military attainments of their commander to which the difference in result is to be attributed. The old soldier lives upon the past, and the young gentleman joining a regiment is so accustomed to hear his older brother officers, to whom he looks up as his masters and teachers, dilate upon the excellence of the previous generations of soldiers, and upon the failings and shortcomings of those he sees around him, that he adopts these views unhesitatingly and in an unquestioning spirit. Such is the influence of discipline upon us, that if our military rulers, by thought, word, or action, allow it to get abroad and be generally understood, that any proposed reform or recently effected change is, in their opinion, contrary to our traditions, and certain to be injurious in its effects, our older officers take up the cry, until it rings in every mess-house, and its echo comes back to us from the morning room of every military club. Discipline is apt to make parrots of us all; we have much less individuality than the members of civil professions. This, in my opinion, accounts very largely for the opposition with which all Mr. Cardwell's reforms have been, and even still are, received by the army, although other very potent agencies have also strengthened that opposition. All armies and navies are naturally conservative in their tendencies, and consequently view with great suspicion any changes effected in their organisation by a Liberal Government. An article of faith with every British soldier is that the authorities of the Horse Guards are his natural protectors, whilst the War Department officials are his enemies, always looking for opportunities to deal him out scant measure, and they are suspected of 'sharp practice' in their interpretation of warrants and regulations regarding the soldier's pay and allowances. The consequence is, that when any scheme of army reform

is started which is supposed to have emanated from the War Office, and to be distasteful to that impersonality the 'Horse Guards,' it is condemned off-hand, and often those who are most outspoken in denouncing it have never even taken the trouble to learn its nature or its objects. Its parentage is enough of itself to damn it in their eyes; but when club gossip asserts that the Horse Guards have refused to adopt it or even to be its godfathers, although solicited by the War Minister to accept that conventional responsibility, there is no measure to their unreasoning condemnation of it.

The facts disclosed in the General Return of the Army, which is compiled at our military head-quarters and annually presented to Parliament, prove so incontestably the improved condition of our army since the introduction of the short service system, that I can only account for the determined opposition it encounters in military circles in the manner I have done in the foregoing remarks. I have the highest authority for pronouncing that system to be a great success, for in a speech made by his Royal Highness the Commander-in-chief in May 1878, he said as follows: 'We have been passing for some time through considerable changes in the army, under the new system of short enlistment, and we were not aware what the exact effect of that system might be; but circumstances have enabled us to test it, and I am happy to say that the success of the measure has been complete. When it was first introduced by my noble friend Lord Cardwell, I had some doubts whether it would answer, but it has succeeded in a manner that neither I, nor any one connected with the army, could have expected;' and he added, 'so far as the army is concerned, it is everything that could be wished.'

Those who are never wearied of pointing back to the condition of our army under the old system of long service, should compare that statement with the condition of the army at the end of the last and the early years of this century, as described in the second volume of Mr. Clode's *Military Forces of the Crown*. We there learn that in those days criminals, paupers, debtors, and vagrants were forced in large numbers to serve in our ranks, and that during the Peninsular War three regiments were formed, and others recruited, by the system of pardoning criminals on condition of their serving abroad. If we turn to the pages of the Duke of Wellington's despatches, what a picture he draws of the discipline and moral condition of the army that his great military genius enabled him to win brilliant victories with! In 1809 he writes to Lord Castlereagh: 'It is impossible to describe to you the irregularities and outrages committed by the troops.' He adds, 'We are an excellent army on parade, an excellent one to fight, but we are worse than an enemy in a country; and take my word for it, that either defeat or success would dissolve us.' The army then was so unpopular that, as he again writes in 1811, 'none but the worst description of men enter the regular service,' although the levy

and bounty money for each recruit from this degraded class amounted to more than 40*l*.

In endeavouring to account for the dislike with which short service is generally viewed in the army, the fact that it adds very considerably to the daily work of regimental officers must not be forgotten. Under the long service system, a regiment in ordinary times required very few recruits each year; now the battalions on home service, having not only to keep their own ranks full, but also to furnish men for their battalions abroad, are, with the exception of those first for foreign service, little more than great depôts or military schools for the manufacture of drilled soldiers. They resemble very closely the battalions of the German army during peace. Unfortunately our regimental officers have not yet learned to accept the position which the German officers have long occupied, namely, that of instructors in drill, discipline, and in those minor tactics which are so well taught in every Prussian barrack. Formerly the small number of recruits joining a battalion were easily drilled by the few non-commissioned officers specially allotted for that duty; now the number of recruits who join the home battalion is so large that unless the company officers assist in their instruction, the necessary number of manufactured soldiers cannot be turned out annually. Henceforward the mode of life of the regimental officer will have to be very different from what it used to be; many hours of idleness daily, the long periods of leave, must be abandoned; he must make up his mind to the constant drudgery of teaching his own men, as the officers of the German army do; and, like them, he will sooner or later have to content himself with the six weeks' leave which is the maximum allowed, even to the officers of the Emperor William's Guard Corps. Hitherto our army has been a pleasant home for idle men; generation after generation of officers have been attracted to it by the ease and pleasure it secured to the English gentleman—enjoyment that was only heightened by the opposite extremes of privation and hard work which an occasional campaign afforded. All this must sooner or later be entirely changed by the system of short service: is it, therefore, to be wondered at that short service should be unpopular with many of our regimental officers?

In considering short service, and with a view to throw some light upon a subject so little understood, I shall briefly state, first, the reasons why it was adopted; secondly, the objects it was intended to secure; and thirdly, the effects it has had already upon the army.

The collapse of our military power towards the latter days of the siege of Sebastopol was so appalling that, for the time, it frightened the nation, and set our educated officers ~~at~~ thinking to account for it, and to devise some scheme which should be capable of saving us from its possible repetition in the future. From 1845 to 1854 we had lived upon the military reputation which the genius of the Duke

of Wellington had won for us in Europe. During that period no great wars had startled the world. No new commander, by newly-devised tactics, and with an army raised upon any new system of organisation, had carried out any important campaign to a brilliant end, overturning in the process some other nation whose military power rested upon the systems that had been matured in the Napoleonic era. The idea that periodical reforms were as necessary to the healthy existence of military institutions as they were to every political constitution, had not been born, or, if contained in the maxims of the great commanders of previous ages, had been forgotten. Up to 1852 our army and Wellington were nearly synonymous terms, so completely was he its undisputed master in nearly all things. As he had grown older the conservatism of old age took hold of him more firmly every year, until at last he deprecated any change. To the soldier of mature years whose mind is still alive to the necessity for constant army reforms, it is sad to peruse the history of 1847, and see the obstinacy with which the Duke opposed the first step then made towards the introduction of short service. We know that he was against the change from flint to percussion locks, and it was not until he had passed away in the fulness of time amidst the universal and very natural grief of the nation whose greatness he had guarded and increased, that we were able to obtain rifled muskets. He had lived to see the system of short service, coupled with army reserves, well developed in Prussia, without perceiving how peculiarly suited such a system is to England, where the spirit and instincts of the people are so opposed to the maintenance of a large standing army. He was not, however, in any way to blame for the general unpreparedness for war in which we found ourselves in 1854. The idea of peace, of eternal peace, had taken hold of the national mind, and no Government, no matter which party might have been in power, could have induced Parliament to maintain, in a condition fit for war, even the small army we had on foot prior to that year. The consequence was that the declaration of war with Russia in 1854 found us unready in every way for the great struggle into which our ministers had, from ignorance of war, allowed us to drift. The Committee of the House of Commons of 1855 on the state of the army reported that 'at the date of the expedition to the East no reserve was provided at home adequate to the undertaking. Mr. Sidney Herbert states in his memorandum of the 27th of November: "The army in the East has been created by discounting the future: every regiment at home, or within reach, and not forming part of the army, has been robbed to complete it. The depôts of battalions under Lord Raglan have been similarly treated."' We began that war by the despatch of a small army of about 20,000 men to the East, but in order to complete the battalions sent out we were obliged, as described in the above quotation, to obtain a large

number of men from the regiments remaining behind, most of which were subsequently sent out themselves, when they in their turn had not only to find men to supply the place of those whom they had a few months before given as volunteers to the corps originally despatched to the Crimea, but also to complete their numbers to war strength by obtaining volunteers from every battalion still left in Great Britain. This system of completing the numbers of a regiment going abroad, especially for active service, by obtaining volunteers from other corps, is a very old one, and has always been resorted to. Yet those who are anxious to decry short service at all hazard, presuming upon the ignorance of the non-military public in the history of former wars, would have us believe that this system of 'volunteering' is a new one, and is the offspring of short service. In most of the newspaper articles and after-dinner speeches, wherein short service is denounced, the most prominent point selected wherewith to point their moral, as well as adorn their tale, is the alleged fact that *esprit de corps* and the regimental system are being now destroyed by the short service law, which entails the transfer and volunteering of men from one regiment to another. We read accounts, told in harrowing sentences, of the manner in which the regiments sent to South Africa after the Isandhlana disaster were made up to their required strength by obtaining volunteers from regiments remaining in England. If those who pen these thrilling narratives would examine into the history of the Crimean War, they would find that, under the long service system to which most of them would have us go back, the regiments that fought in it had their numbers also made up to the required strength in a similar manner.

No one can dislike this plan of largely filling up the ranks of a battalion by volunteers from many other regiments more than I do; but I am anxious to show my non-military readers that this system is by no means new, and has no necessary connection whatever with short service. Indeed, it is because I am most anxious to see this objectionable practice put an end to that I am such a warm upholder of short service, for through it and by means of it alone can we ever hope to create such an army reserve as will enable us to complete our regiments to war strength when it is necessary to do so, without having recourse to the old system of volunteering. If in 1854 we had had an efficient army reserve of say 60,000 men, we should not have had to go round cap in hand to all the regiments staying at home begging for men, and offering them bounties to volunteer into those ordered to the East. If we had had such a reserve in 1878, we could easily have obtained the three or four thousand volunteers required for Zululand from it, without asking for a soldier serving in any home garrison.

In 1854-55, when all the soldiers we had in our small home army had been sent to the Crimea, and all our colonies and Mediterranean

stations had been robbed of every available drilled man, their places, where it was absolutely necessary, being temporarily filled by militia, we found ourselves at the end of our military resources; having no reserve to fall back upon, we were reduced to the undignified expedient—an expedient unworthy of a great nation—of raising foreign legions. When Lord Raglan in this extremity was informed by his Government that 2,000 more recruits would be sent him, he begged they might be kept where they were. He said he preferred to wait, as those last sent to him ‘were so young and unformed that they fell victims to disease, and were swept away like flies.’

Surely those who now advocate a return to our old army system, if system it can be called, must either be ignorant of or have forgotten the sort of drafts that under it were annually sent from England to India, and also the condition in which they were sent, to fill up the regiments serving there. Before the Mutiny, under the long service system, I have seen drafts of many hundreds of men embark for that country in a state of inefficiency that few of our younger officers could now realise. Not only were they from extreme youth utterly unfit for Indian service, but most of them were entirely undrilled, many of them never having had even a musket in their hands. With a large draft of this nature for the regiment I had been gazetted to, I landed at Rangoon in the middle of the Burmah War of 1852, and with them I went into action for the first time, where the great bulk of them fired a musket for the first time in their lives. Like the recruits described by Lord Raglan, they also died ‘like flies.’ Our battalions in India at that time were very fine, the result of the natural law, the ‘survival of the fittest.’ None but the strongest bore up against the climate to which they were exposed in the immaturity of their ‘teens,’ and as a matter of course the residuum constituted, physically speaking, a splendid corps. But their appearance on parade only told the bright side of the army system then: its sad chapters were alone to be learnt in the graveyards of the Indian stations.

Nor were the regiments sent to the colonies in those days all that imagination paints them at this distance of time. I know of an instance of a battalion hurried off from England during the rebellion in Canada, in such an inefficient condition that it landed without either arms or accoutrements and most imperfectly clothed. And what was the moral condition of the men in those halcyon days of long service? In the year 1858—it was certainly an exceptional year—over 20,000 men deserted, and in the following year the number of desertions was 11,328.

The Indian Mutiny of 1857 again found us unprepared for the strain of war; we had no army reserves, and all that our military administrators could devise as means to obtain men was the old expedient of going into the labour market to purchase men by the inducement of large bounties. Although they lowered the standard

to five feet three inches at the same time, it was impossible to complete the army establishment. That very low standard was continued for some years, and yet we find in the evidence given before the Recruiting Commission that made its report in 1860, that 7,000 men were still wanting in 1859 to bring the army up to the numbers voted by Parliament, although boys instead of men had been enlisted. The Recruiting Commission of 1866 again called attention to the serious defect then 'existing in the extreme youth and short service of the soldiers sent abroad as reliefs.' That Commission went on to say :—

'A return, prepared for us, of the ages and periods of service of men sent out as drafts to India during the last two years (between the 1st of January, 1864, and the 31st of December, 1865) shows that out of a total number of 5,022 no less than 2,093 were under twenty years of age, and 796 between twenty and twenty-one years. Thus there were more than one-half (2,880) under twenty-one years of age, and in some regiments the proportion was much greater.'

I wish my readers to remember that these remarks referred to a time of peace under the long service system.

The war in Bohemia of 1866 drew attention in a striking manner to the Prussian system of army organisation, and the means by which a very poor State was enabled to put a very large army in the field for war, without keeping the great bulk of it under arms during peace. A study of the Prussian organisation showed that its foundations were based upon the obligation of every healthy, full-grown man to serve in the ranks, and upon the creation of a great army reserve by means of short service. England was not, nor is she now, prepared to adopt the principle of universal service, but the creation of a reserve, the men composing which, after a thorough training in the army, should, during peace, follow civil avocations, and live to all intents and purposes as ordinary citizens, seemed peculiarly suited to the genius and habits of the English people. This idea having more or less taken hold of the public mind, simmered and grew stronger, and when the great events of 1870 startled the world, most of us held our breath as we asked each other, 'Were *we* safe as a nation?' We at last seemed to realise that it might at any moment become necessary for us to send a force of one or two army corps to Belgium in accordance with our treaty engagements, and realised at the same time that to do what we did in 1854, that is, send an expeditionary force abroad, unless we had behind it a reserve at least equal to it in numbers, would only be to court the humiliations that befell us then and in the following year.

All serious thinkers upon our army requirements, then, at last seemed to agree to the three following postulates :—

1st, That for the protection of these islands from invasion, for the defence of our foreign possessions, for the maintenance of our rule in India, and to enable us to fulfil our treaty obligations in Europe, we might at any moment find it necessary to put in the

field an army of about 60,000 men, which should have behind it a thoroughly efficient reserve of well-trained soldiers of at least equal numbers.

2ndly, It would only be by a system of keeping the great bulk of that force during peace as an inexpensive reserve, that we could hope to induce Parliament to sanction its formation ; and,

3rdly, That it was only possible to have such a reserve at all by altering the terms of the soldier's engagement, so that when he had learnt his work thoroughly by a few years' service with a regiment, he should pass the remaining portion of that engagement as a reserve man in civil life, with the obligation to serve when called upon to do so in time of war.

To a very large extent, these are the conclusions upon which most of the great continental military systems are based ; if we add the generally-accepted axiom that, when a soldier is kept in our service much over twelve years, there is a moral obligation on the part of the State to provide for his old age by giving him a pension, and the corollary upon it, that for economy's sake it is most undesirable to keep men so long with the colours that they can justly claim such a boon, then I think I may say these were the reasons that in 1870 led Lord Cardwell to introduce the existing short service system into our army. He saw that our military requirements could only be supplied by means of short service, and he therefore based our reformed military organisation upon it.

To those who will carefully study the problem he had to solve, I think it will be clear that we cannot at one and the same time have a really efficient army reserve upon which to rely in time of war, and have also during peace a standing army of old soldiers with the colours.

I am well aware that a large proportion of our very oldest officers demur to these conclusions ; their aspirations do not soar beyond the creation of a standing army of well set-up, perfectly drilled soldiers, such as we possessed before the Crimean War. They don't believe in a reserve they cannot see, and they believe only in the men whom they can daily inspect in Hyde Park or at Aldershot. They should, however, remember how that fine army, to which their thoughts recur with satisfaction, melted away quickly before the dread realities of our greatest siege, and that whilst the brilliant victories of Alma, Balaclava, and Inkerman are now forgotten in Europe, the story of our subsequent humiliation is well remembered. And what was the cause of that humiliation ? It was because our army then was incapable of any sustained effort, owing to the want of an army reserve to supply its losses in the field. It is because I remember those days when I saw our military power collapse on the Sebastopol plateau, that I shudder as I hear men talk calmly of reverting to the long service system of that time. An army composed,

as ours was then, of a first line and nothing more, is worse than a sham, for it deludes the nation into a false confidence in its military strength, which must always sooner or later lead it to like misfortune.

Amongst the many objects it was hoped to secure by the introduction of the present system of short service with the colours was that of removing the unpopularity of the army with the classes from which we must look for recruits. Before 1870 the great majority of the men who enlisted served for the full term of twenty-one years, which entitled them to a small pension. This pension was not large enough to support even those who had no families, and many were so broken down by service in tropical and unhealthy climates as to be unable to earn wages by hard work. In every parish there were consequently discharged soldiers whose miserable condition was a warning to all the young men of their neighbourhood to shun the army as an occupation. Two-thirds of our army were constantly abroad, and a youth who left his friends to join a regiment at a foreign station was regarded as lost for ever to his family, so few comparatively ever returned home. Under a system of long service, even when we reduced the standard of height and chest measurement to a boy's dimensions, and offered large bounties even for immature striplings quite incapable of supporting fatigue, we were still unable to fill our ranks when the least strain was brought to bear upon our army. It was a dreadful thing this enlistment for twenty-one years; it meant the severance of every tie with home, and even those who left the army after a ten years' engagement often found themselves adrift on the world, with impaired health; they had no connection with civil life, and were often little better, indeed, than strangers in the districts where they had lived in boyhood. The heavy obligation of lengthened service to be undertaken upon enlistment deterred numbers from joining the army. The poor man could not hope to purchase his discharge, and all knew that the heaviest penalties were incurred by desertion. The doggerel describing the sailor's horror of a visit to Lagos gives a fair idea of the way in which enlistment for long service in the army used to be regarded:—

The Bight of Bennin, the Bight of Bennin,
Whence few come out, though many go in.

The long service system gave us a number of old non-commissioned officers and privates who were incapable of supporting the fatigues of active service. Every regiment that went to the Crimea left many of such men behind it.

It is curious that whilst we hear on all sides a cry for rapid promotion amongst the officers, we hear one also for old non-commissioned officers. If the latter had the same opportunities for ventilating their views, it is tolerably certain their cry would be the reverse of that of the commissioned officer; they would naturally say,

‘Give *us* quick promotion, and the slower the promotion amongst the officers of our regiment the better, as we shall have fewer young gentlemen to drill and teach military duty to than at present.’ Now I believe that it is as essential to have young sergeants as it is to have young officers. If promotion is very slow amongst the corporals and sergeants, it kills ambition amongst your best men. I hope we shall very shortly see great improvements effected both in the pay and position of our non-commissioned officers. They are very badly remunerated at present, and they and their families are by no means as well provided with accommodation in barracks as they should be. But anxious as I am to see them well paid and raised in social position, I hope they may not be retained as a rule with their line battalions more than about fourteen or fifteen years, after which period of service they should pass into one of the militia battalions belonging to their regiment, or into one of the volunteer corps of the county or district to which that regiment belongs.

Short service was designed to bring about these reforms, to which Lord Cardwell attached so much importance. He hoped thereby to induce a better class to enlist, so as to widen the field from which really well-educated men could be selected for the ranks of corporal and sergeant. Formerly a large proportion of our non-commissioned officers had little or no education at all. The old colour-sergeant of the company, or the old sergeant-major of the troop, relieved his captain of much of the work that properly speaking should have been done by the officer, whereas with young sergeants, who after perhaps ten years’ service in that rank leave for service in the militia or volunteers, the captain has more responsibility and more duty thrown upon him. Is it therefore unnatural that the officer should cry out in favour of the old-fashioned sergeant, although he was more stupid and not nearly so well-educated as the sergeant of the present day? However, we must not attach too much weight to cries of this sort, for there are at all times those who believe that what is past and gone was best, and that everything and every institution of the day is inferior to those of past years. Before the introduction of the present short service system, we had much difficulty in keeping the ranks of the army full, although we only required from about 10,000 to 15,000 recruits annually, and paid a bounty to every man who was attested. I have already described how during the Peninsular War we had to empty our prisons to obtain soldiers, although we were offering a bounty of 40*l.* for every recruit; how during the Crimean War, when high bounties were also offered, we so completely failed to obtain recruits at home in sufficient numbers, that we had to beat up for them in the purlieus of continental towns; and how we were unable to keep our regiments full during the Indian Mutiny although we enlisted weedy boys unfit for a soldier’s life. How different have been our recruiting returns since 1870! In 1876 we

enlisted over 29,000 men; in 1877 and in 1878, over 28,000; and in 1879—the last year embraced in our published returns—over 25,000.

But it is said we are now enlisting boys: the extracts I have already given from the Recruiting Commissions of 1860 and of 1866 describe the worthlessness of the recruits we obtained under the long service system of those times; so even were it impossible to show that the men who now enlist are of a better type, it could not be affirmed with any regard for accuracy that we are worse off now under the existing system of short service. I think, however, that a perusal of the tables given in the last General Annual Return of the British Army, which was presented to Parliament last year, will prove incontestably that man for man the recruits we obtain now are morally better, and physically stronger, than those we enlisted prior to 1870.

At page 62 of that Report it is shown that from the year 1861 down to 1870 the number of recruits of superior education in every 1,000 enlisted ranged from 52 to 68, whilst in the first year given in the table after the introduction of short service, that proportion rose with a bound to 137, and went on annually increasing until we find that on the 1st of January, 1880, it stood at 576 per 1,000 men. In 1865 there were 109 courts-martial to every 1,000 men in the army; in 1879 that proportion had fallen to 85. In 1869, the number of minor punishments inflicted by order of commanding officers was 1,405 per 1,000 men, and in 1879 it had fallen to 1,386. In 1861 the percentage of deserters to recruits was 41, in 1879 it had fallen to 16. In 1871 and 1879 the strength of the army was identical, so we can compare the returns for those years with advantage; in the former year the net loss by desertion was 3,055 men, being a percentage of 1·66 on the total establishment of the army, while in the latter year those numbers were 1,807 and 0·99. If statistics are of any value, these figures tell a healthy story of moral improvement in our army that no amount of club gossip and irresponsible letter-writing can gainsay.

With reference to the physique and youth of the recruits we obtain now, there seems to be a generally accepted belief that the immaturity of the men we enlist and send to India is directly attributable to the short service system. I hope to prove that the recruits who now join are far superior physically to those we sent to the Crimea, whom Lord Raglan condemned as worse than useless, or than those we sent to India during the Mutiny, whom the Recruiting Commission referred to as 'boys.' But were I unable to do so, I should in any case wish to impress upon my readers that there is no necessary connection between the short service system and the physique of the men who enlist, beyond the fact that, as enlistment for short service with the colours is more popular than for a long term, we are more likely to obtain stronger and in every way better men under the former

than under the latter system. Were it thought advisable to do so, there is no reason why we should not now lay it down as a rule, that no man under twenty-five years of age and five feet ten inches in height should be enlisted. We could do so under the short, quite as well as under the long, service system. The only point involved, and it would be common to both systems, is, that you will have to offer the man of twenty-five far better pay than the youth of nineteen or twenty years of age. This question of age is not one of sentiment, it is one of money. The man of twenty-two, twenty-three, or twenty-four years of age has already adopted some settled means for earning a livelihood; to enlist would not be to better himself, and consequently we obtain very few recruits of that time of life. It is different with the very young man of nineteen or twenty years, for he is still more or less, as it were, a waif and stray, and is more easily attracted by the glamour which must always in some degree hang round the career of a soldier.

We hear on all sides complaints that our recruits are younger and weaker than those we obtained formerly, and because short service is distasteful to many of our older officers, we are told it is that system to which these melancholy results are attributable. Here is what our published statistics tell us. In 1846, before the introduction of the 'Limited Service Act,' in the cavalry and infantry the number of men per 1,000 under twenty years of age was 126·9; in the army generally in 1871 there were 190, whilst in 1880 there were only 100 per thousand under that age. In 1871 there were in the army 490 men per 1,000 between twenty and thirty years (this is the class of men that forms the backbone of every army), of whom there were 664 per 1,000 in 1880. This satisfactory result is obtained without including our army reserve, who in the event of war would rejoin the colours, and who, being all men of between twenty-four and thirty years of age, would, had their numbers been included in the returns from which these figures are taken, have made the comparison between former years and 1880 still more strikingly in favour of the army of to-day. The average age of the recruits who joined in 1863 was twenty years and three months; since then there has been a gradual but small increase in age; and in 1877, the last year included in the return from which I quote, that average age was twenty years and seven months.

The standard of height for the infantry of the line is now five feet six inches, and for chest measurement it is thirty-four inches, no recruit is accepted who does not fulfil these requirements, which are in excess of those in all, and are much higher than those in most continental armies. Some indeed are in favour of lowering these standards, because in consequence of them we are forced to reject so many recruits whose chest measurement is only thirty-three inches, but whom, in every other respect, it would be desirable to enlist.

Without in any way going back to the very low standards to which we have often had to resort in the days of long service, we could at any moment increase the number of our recruits very considerably by reducing our standard to that of Germany or of France. In 1873 there were in every 1,000 men in the army 412 under 5ft. 7in., and 588 over that same height; in 1880 the numbers were 398 and 602 respectively. Surely these facts show a decided improvement in the physical strength of our soldiers, and afford a positive denial to all the wild statements which are so commonly bandied about as to the inferiority of the recruits who now enlist under the short service system, compared with those we used to obtain formerly.

All changes, all reforms are very distasteful to some of our oldest officers, who, in order to enlist the popular sympathy on their side, declare that short service and the recent reforms in our military organisation are destructive to discipline, to *esprit de corps*, and to the regimental system. These expressions are shibboleths wherewith to conjure on all military questions, just as a cry of 'No Popery,' or 'The Church in danger,' has before now been used to excite the masses politically. Outside the army very few indeed know what is meant by the 'Regimental System,' but they know it is the common name for a military idol. No one can value more highly than I do the three essentials to military excellence that I have named. Without discipline and *esprit de corps* no army can hold together on active service or ever be worth much, and every one who has really served in one of our regiments during war, who has commanded a company on active service, knows as well as I do that our admirable regimental system is above all things calculated to foster the growth and further the maintenance both of discipline and of *esprit de corps*. It is, however, because I wish to have better material, both in a moral and a physical sense, to work upon and to imbue with these attributes, that I rejoice in the fact that the old order of long service has given place to the new one of the present day; and it is because I wish to see them intensified and extended so as to embrace the militia as well as the army, that I advocate the complete fulfilment of the localisation scheme embodied and fully described in the Report of the Militia Committee, over which Colonel Stanley, the Secretary of State for War under the late Government, presided. I cannot in this article enter upon any description of that scheme—I may possibly do so later on—but I earnestly hope that Mr. Childers may not be deterred by any such clamour as that now raised against short service, the unsoundness of which I have endeavoured to expose, from carrying out that scheme in its entirety, and to its only logical conclusion.

G. J. WOLSELEY, Lieutenant-General.

HOLLAND AND THE TRANSVAAL.

It would be necessary to go back to the years 1830 and 1831 in Dutch history to find the parallel to the national movement which has passed over Holland in the first months of this year.

The news of the armed rising of the Transvaal Boers has produced the effect of an electric shock through the whole of the Netherlands. All classes, all political parties, all religious denominations, have equally shared in the general enthusiasm. The smallest villages and remotest districts have followed the example of the large towns in organising meetings to discuss the interests of the Transvaal, and to raise money for alleviating the sufferings caused by the war in South Africa. One of the most considered of Dutch savants, the almost septuagenarian Professor of Natural Science at the University of Utrecht, Dr. P. Harting, has taken the lead in drawing up a memorial to the British nation, which, after having been signed in a few days by a number of Dutchmen forming the most distinguished part of the nation, has been sent to England and published by the various organs of public opinion. Under the auspices of the same Professor, a Transvaal Committee has been formed, composed principally of men holding high scientific positions, whose object is to enlighten public opinion as much as possible about the dispositions and intentions of the Boers.

The whole Dutch press, irrespective of its political opinions, has declared itself in favour of the Transvaal Boers. The Dutch papers have daily devoted a great part of their columns to the Transvaal, in order to satisfy the universal interest. In a word, no foreign event has for years excited the minds in Holland so much as the present war in South Africa.

It need hardly be pointed out that the general movement in this country has a very peculiar character, completely different from the isolated manifestations in favour of the Boers in Germany, France, and America. In Frankfort, Paris, or New York, either political calculations or the indefinite sympathy for all nations fighting for their independence may have had their influence, but in Holland the feeling of community of race was uppermost.

We have ancestors in common with the African Boers, of whom we are justly proud. In struggling for their independence, the Boers

are doing now what our common ancestors did three hundred years ago, when they declared themselves free from their allegiance to the mighty king of Spain. The history of that ever memorable eighty years' struggle, which since our schooldays has been a household tale with us, is remembered in South African homesteads with as much enthusiasm as on the marshy soil which witnessed it. In those South African farms Dutch manners and customs prevail, Dutch Calvinism is professed in its most characteristic form, and the same language which is spoken at Amsterdam and at the Hague may be heard on the Drakensberg and among the rocks of the Lang Nek pass.

When, a hundred years ago, the American colonists rose against England, a strong political party in what was then the Republic of the United Netherlands succeeded in forcing the Stadtholder to give his assistance to America. Dislike of England, more than sympathy for the Americans, was the motive of that party.

Fortunately at present the situation in the Netherlands is wholly changed. Not an atom of hostility towards England is mixed up with the sympathy for the Boers. On the contrary, it is the general respect and cordial friendship for Great Britain which keep the friends of the Transvaal in Holland from too loud protests.

No Dutchman will accuse England of having annexed the Transvaal from mere love of conquest, or from any idle wish to increase the number of her subjects. We willingly recognise that the form of government of the Transvaal was imperfect, and that the political institutions which the English Government established were in theory much better; we do not doubt for a moment that Sir Bartle Frere and Sir Theophilus Shepstone were actuated by a sincere wish for the welfare of the inhabitants of the Transvaal; we accuse English officials of no tyranny, and we are fully convinced of the truth of the declaration of Sir John Lubbock in the House of Commons, that 'the Transvaal will be none the less free because it forms a part of the great Empire of Great Britain.'

But we recognise as decidedly the right of the Transvaal Boers to refuse all those benefits. If they prefer their imperfect form of government to the better organised English administration, simply because the one is self-government and the other a form of government imposed by a foreign Power, they do exactly what the Spaniards did in the beginning of this century. When Napoleon wanted to replace their own mediæval type of government by more free institutions, they found a powerful ally in England in their just resistance to the constitutional king imposed on them by France.

We, of course, do not mean to compare the motives of the French Emperor with those of the English Government of 1877, but in both cases the result was the same. What the Boers are doing now, we believe every European nation that loves its independence would do. We Dutchmen would be the first to act in a similar way if a covetous

neighbour, under the pretext of giving us the benefit of his institutions, threatened our independence. There can be no doubt that, apart from the special connection of Holland with the Transvaal, considerations of this nature have largely influenced Dutch opinion. To deny the right of nations and states to dispose of their own destinies at their own pleasure and to judge for themselves what is conducive to their happiness, is a most dangerous principle for the existence of small States, especially where annexations are carried out from the purest motives. The good aims which one power exercises in reality are too easily made a pretext by another, and soon every conquest and annexation, however iniquitous and unwarrantable, is completely justified.

Sir Bartle Frere, in his interesting article about the Transvaal which appeared in the last number of this Review, speaks of Dutchmen 'who look forward to the ultimate absorption of Holland into the Germanic Empire.' We do not know whether such Dutchmen actually exist—we fortunately have never come across any—but this we do know, that it is that section of the Dutch nation which, if there were any danger of the absorption of their country into the German or any other Empire, would appeal to England in the first place, that has been most painfully impressed by the events in the Transvaal.

But those Dutchmen, of whom Sir Bartle Frere suspected the existence, would, according to him, wish for the conversion of the Transvaal into an allied colony of Germany. Where, as I stated above, the persons themselves are unknown quantities to me, I cannot judge of their wishes and objects. Among the Dutchmen of my acquaintance there are few who have ever contemplated the eventuality of a German connection with the Transvaal, and there is not one among them who would contemplate such a combination with equanimity.

The position of our race in South Africa would not certainly be improved by being enmeshed between two great powers. The relations between the Dutch and English already have given rise to difficulties. With the German race the Dutch have much less in common, and they would find it, in the long run, impossible to live on good terms with them. The uneasy relations between the German missionaries and the Transvaal Boers somewhat illustrate this fact.

There exists besides a more general reason why no Dutchman will wish for any intervention of Germany in South African affairs. It is a reason which is self-evident, and can be better appreciated in England than in any other country in the world. No English statesman can wish that either Germany, or Italy, or any other non-colonial European power, should make the acquisition of colonies an object of its policy. And if one of the most powerful European States, with the largest colonial dependencies in the world, objects to the prospect of new colonial rivals, how much more strongly will that

objection be felt by a people with much smaller dependencies beyond the sea and with a European territory comparatively much smaller!

A German protectorate is certainly the last thing we wish for our Transvaal brethren. If they cannot live without protection, then may England discharge those functions; but we are not yet convinced that they are unable to protect themselves. A population which of its own accord leaves its homesteads to defend its independence on its frontiers against an enemy superior in numbers, shows, it seems to me, that it possesses sufficient energy and national vigour to be able to maintain its independent existence. That they are less skilled in the difficult science of government than the civilised European nations who have had a long experience is natural. And even in some civilised States of Europe such conflicts between the executive and the legislative powers as appear to have taken place in 1877 in the Transvaal are not unknown. President Burgers may have uttered bitter words about the Volksraad, and the Volksraad may have shown itself intractable towards the President, but at least let it not be forgotten that the one thing they agreed in was a protest against the annexation by England.

Will such an annexation, which, as its partisans must themselves admit, has never received the formal sanction which they maintain it might so easily have obtained, be upheld by the English Government against the manifest will of the people?

As a foreigner I will abstain from criticising the colonial policy of the present English Government in South Africa. As a Dutchman I hope that the claims of my countrymen in South Africa may be weighed and considered with as much care as those of the races in the Balkan peninsula.

England's prestige on the Continent is sufficient not to require for its sake an easy military triumph over a weaker and badly equipped enemy.

However great may be the tension and anxiety in Holland, we still trust in the justice and impartiality of the English Government, and in the feelings of generosity and loyalty of the British nation.

W. H. DE BEAUFORT.

THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.

No. L.—APRIL 1881.

THE MILITARY IMPOTENCE OF GREAT BRITAIN.

ON November 9, 1876, Benjamin Disraeli, as Premier of Great Britain, made a speech at the Lord Mayor's banquet in London which attracted immense notice. The political importance of the speaker, the tone of the speech, the universal echo it found in the country, justify the reproduction of its most noticeable phrases at the commencement of this paper. 'There is no country,' said Disraeli, 'so interested in the maintenance of peace as England. Peace is especially an English policy. She is not an aggressive Power, for there is nothing which she desires: she covets no cities and no provinces.'

Who was not reminded by these words of the memorable speech of Louis Napoleon, when Prince-President, at the banquet of the Chambers of Commerce at Bordeaux, on October 9, 1852, which culminated in the famous phrase, 'L'empire c'est la paix'? The Empire which this speech was to introduce came, but it was war; war in the Crimea, in Italy, in Cochin China, in Mexico—in France.

Disraeli had surely only to thank his famous predecessor, if the world did not entirely believe in 'Peace so especially the policy of England.' To be sure, the noble lord who from 1874 to 1879 governed the British Empire with strong hand did his best to keep alive this distrust in the truth of his words. Although nothing existed which England could wish for, although she desired no states, no provinces, yet she has pushed forward the boundary lines of her power within the last five years. In 1874 England occupied Lahedsch, in Arabia, and annexed the Fiji Islands; in 1875 pur-

chased Mohammereh, at the mouth of the Euphrates, and by the acquisition of 177,000 Suez Canal shares gained a *casus interventionis* in Egypt; in 1877 she occupied Khetta, in Beloochistan, and annexed, in spite of the protests of the population, the Transvaal Republic in South Africa; in 1878 she occupied Cyprus. During this period she felt herself threatened and disturbed by the French, the Turks, the Russians in India, and by the first-named also in Africa. She has had repeated differences with Egypt, and quite lately also with Burma; has been very near a warlike collision with Guatemala, China, and Russia; and has actually gone to war with the Ashantis, Afridis, Afghans, and Zulus.

This, then, is peace—the policy so peculiarly England's! Nevertheless, we are of the same opinion as Disraeli—that there is no country so interested in the preservation of peace as England. A State whose prosperity, under the blessings of peace—as Porter informs us—amounts to the yearly sum of 80,000,000*l.*, dreads naturally the burning questions of high policy, and their solution through blood and iron. But still more powerful than the interests of Britain is the spirit of the age. In the struggle for existence, the recognition of the importance of economic factors and the pursuit of material gain become every day more universal. Wherever the spirit of enterprise spreads its wings it encounters the resistance of Great Britain—hitherto the Farmer-General of the profits of the world.

In this daily-widening contest England recognises her conflicting interests, and feels that she will be obliged to want states and provinces—nay, even to make war—if she is to preserve her existence. The British Empire, spread over the whole world, must have its military representatives, ready to fight and prepared to strike for the protection of its interests throughout the world.

Is this, however, the case? Does England's readiness for war correspond to the world-wide extent of this empire, and to the dangers involved in it? Does it correspond to the requirements of modern warfare? The Premier of England answered these questions with a proud 'Yes.'

'But although the policy of England is peace,' he continued in his speech at the banquet, 'there is no country so well prepared for war as our own. What she wishes is to maintain and to enjoy the unexampled empire which she has built up, and which it is her pride to remember exists as much upon sympathy as upon force. If she enters into conflict in a righteous cause—and I will not believe that England will go to war except for a righteous cause—if the contest is one which concerns her liberty, her independence, or her empire, her resources, I feel, are inexhaustible. She is not a country that, when she enters into a campaign, has to ask herself whether she can support a second or a third campaign. She enters into a campaign which she will not terminate till right is done.'

The effect of this speech on the audience was, as might be expected, highly inflammatory. The subdued rage which had been aroused in the nobility and gentry of the country by the consideration

of Asiatic affairs dissolved under the impression of the bold words of the noble lord in a feeling of power, self-consciousness, and pride. Before the speaker, perhaps, hovered the form of the great Pitt; before his mind's eye, perhaps, rose up that proud time of English history when British gold gave life to the coalition of Europe against France, set her troops in motion, and healed her wounds; that period when England deluged the Continent with her agents, and fought the French Republic by smuggling in false assignats, by tricks and conspiracies; that proud time when countless troops of English soldiers fought now on the Continent, now in the Colonies, and English war fleets covered every sea. It was only natural that Disraeli's speech should produce a fiery effect throughout the whole of Great Britain. We, however, who are not Englishmen, nor boon companions of the Lord Mayor of London, can, without eliciting any rebuke, apply the knife of criticism to this important after-dinner speech, and with sharp shears separate the truth and falsehood which are so remarkably mingled together in it.

'There is no country,' says Disraeli, 'that is so well prepared for war as England;' and, in full consciousness that he is addressing the richest country in the world, he proceeds: 'it is not a country which, at the outbreak of a war, requires to ask whether it can support a second or a third campaign.'

In this sense, doubtless, also General le Bœuf, French Minister of War, had a full right to exclaim to the deputies who thronged around him at the memorable sitting of July 10, 1870, '*Nous sommes archi-prêts.*' If any country, surely France—France, crushed in so unprecedented a manner in 1870-1—can declare that her resources are practically inexhaustible. And yet history replied to the phrase '*Nous sommes archi-prêts*' with the battles of Metz, the catastrophe of Sedan, the capture of the Rhine army, the capitulation of Paris, the surrender of Alsace-Lorraine, and the payment of 5,000 million francs as a war indemnity. Here, as on each of her pages, history furnishes a proof that all the resources, all the riches in the world, are inadequate to compensate for the want of a military organisation suited to the times.

If we desire to obtain a clear notion of Great Britain's capability for going to war, we must turn our attention to its military resources compared with the political problems it has to face.

GREAT BRITAIN AS A NAVAL POWER.

For fully ten years, from 1858-1868, France maintained—without proof, indeed, yet without challenge—the position of first naval Power. Since the war with Germany, however, she has been content with the second place; and England has taken the opportunity to resume her natural position as first naval Power.

Britain's naval and mercantile fleets stand alone in their grandeur.

According to the comparisons, equally well grounded and objective, instituted by Ward Hunt and Reed—comparisons which in spite of differences of method have given a similar result—the British ironclad fleet of to-day is one-third stronger than that of the French. Still more favourable, however, is the proportion of the British mercantile navy to that of her rival.

The tonnage of British sailing vessels compared with that of all other naval Powers combined is as 1 : 2, the tonnage of its steam vessels as 1 : 1.

No other country has Great Britain's capacity for building, equipping, and manning a navy at such short notice. No other navy possesses the British freedom of action, as no other possesses such a net of coaling stations, harbours of refuge, and repairing docks, spread over the whole world and connected by submarine cable. Great, however, as is the war navy of Great Britain taken *absolutely*, its political tasks are far greater. To contend with foreign war fleets, to protect British and capture foreign merchant vessels sailing on every sea, to secure the communication between the single parts of the United Kingdom, and between it and the colonies; to support the land troops in protecting the mother-country and the foreign possessions, as well as, finally, to carry on offensive warfare—what a varied programme!

The British navy stands in but a dubious position when compared with the great and manifold tasks which await it. The *relative* weakness of the British navy appears at once, from its local distribution. The distribution of the English war navy—that is to say, of 'ships in commission'—on October 2, 1880, was as follows:—

In the United Kingdom for coast defence and

harbour service	37	vessels, including 8 ironclads
Channel squadron	5	" 4 "
Detached squadron	4	" 2 "
Mediterranean fleet	23	" 7 "
East Indies	10	" — "
Indian troop service	5	" 3 "
China	19	" — "
Australia	9	" — "
North America and West Indies	13	" 1 "
South-east coast of America	4	" — "
Pacific station	15	" 2 "
East coast of Africa	1	" — "
West coast of Africa and Cape	8	" — "
Particular service	9	" — "
Surveying	6	" — "
Ordered home	6	" — "
In the harbours of Chatham (1), Portsmouth (16), and Devonport (12)	29	" — "
Total . 203 vessels, including 27 ironclads		

The British war navy, then, to correspond with the colonial possessions and the commerce of the kingdom, is scattered over the whole world.

England is most strongly represented at sea on the way to India, China, and Japan, Australia and New Zealand. No less than sixty-one ships of war, including ten ironclads, keep guard on these seas. The chain of harbours on this route is undoubtedly strong. Gibraltar, Malta, Cyprus, Aden, Perim, Galle, Singapore, and Hong Kong, enable British ships to take in coal along the entire route.

It can cause no surprise that this is the route on which Great Britain is most strongly represented. It is her most important commercial route; yet on no other does she find herself so insecure. Before all, France must cause her anxiety, whose war navy—at the end of 1879 was not less than 498 vessels, including 59 ironclads—is for the most part stationed in Europe, directly opposite her own.

The road to India leads through the Mediterranean, far too distant from England, and at present much more a French than an English lake. It is questionable whether Gibraltar and Malta could supply a large steam fleet for any length of time; while there is no doubt that France would be fully equal to the task, more especially since she has fully secured the possession of Algeria. Thus this route, which is by far the most important line of operations and communications for Great Britain, passes through a defile commanded on either side by France. Pressing as she does on this defile with the weight of a first-class naval Power, France obliges the British Mediterranean Fleet to be kept up to its full strength even in time of peace. Further, by means of her well-developed network of railways, France can in a few days collect strong masses of troops on the coast, and ship them over to England in a few hours. Still more insecure is the second defile of this world-thoroughfare, the Suez Canal. It is, in fact, in foreign hands. England could only assure herself of this important link in the chain after a military occupation of Egypt. The occupation of Egypt, however, leaving out of sight the rivalries of other great Powers, would require an expenditure of military strength of which Great Britain is only very conditionally capable.

Lastly, a third defile belongs still to the future. The aspirations of Italy toward Tunis are well known. Their realisation would produce yet another narrow strait, no wider than the Channel between England and France.

On the Atlantic, above all the theatre of the world's commerce, *Great Britain is even weaker than in the East.* On this enormous expanse—1,626,000 geographical square miles¹—she places only twenty-five ships of war, including one ironclad, leaving out of con-

¹ The areas throughout are measured in German geographical miles, one-fifteenth of a degree.—*Translator.*

sideration the reserve fleet disbanded in time of peace, and the vessels engaged in coast defence and harbour service in the United Kingdom. Nevertheless, the British believe that even here they are stronger than any other Power, and think that even an American combination, owing to the weak condition of the United States navy at present, could effect nothing against them.

This is true only for the beginning of a war, and then only conditionally on naval warfare being regarded as solely a contest between ships of war. Yet even so the British cannot put very much confidence in their position.

The maritime position of the United States is undoubtedly better to-day than it was at the beginning of the war of 1812-14. At that time England stood at the zenith of her naval power, and was the undisputed mistress of every sea; while the United States possessed only six frigates and an inconsiderable number of smaller vessels. It was this very war which brought the American naval power into such repute among other navies, and gained her the greatest distinction. In all single engagements, with one exception, the Americans were the victors.

At the beginning of a war, however, the Americans would perhaps be at a disadvantage as compared with the British. But a naval war with England is always a long business. The Americans would find time to create a fleet; and what they are capable of in this line they showed in the war of secession, 1861-5. Counting at the beginning of the war forty-two vessels, only partly seaworthy, they raised themselves in the space of a year to the first rank among naval powers; while at the end of the war their fleet consisted of no less than 761 ships of war, including seventy-one ironclads.

The naval basis of operations which the United States possess in the western shore of the Atlantic is without a doubt immensely superior to that of the British. The United States navy is supported by an admirably developed coast line extending nearly 5,000 nautical miles, and providing the most copious resources. For the British, on the other hand, Halifax and Bermuda are undoubtedly of high value, but as yet they are united by no cable. St. Helena and the Falkland Islands are important stations in the South Atlantic Ocean: but the former still lacks telegraphic communication with the Cape, and the latter, commanding the route round Cape Horn, is completely unprotected. *In the Pacific Ocean Great Britain is the weakest of all.* British ships of war are stationed to the number of nineteen in Chinese waters, nine in Australia, and only eleven on the west coast of the two Americas. Melbourne and Sydney, Adelaide and Brisbane, the Bay of Islands, Auckland, Dunedin, and Fiji, are either insufficiently guarded or not at all, and further, are not in possession of complete telegraphic communication. Victoria and Vancouver's Island are in a similar case, while between these and Fiji and Hong Kong,

England possesses no naval station at all. On this enormous expanse of water—3,300,000 geographical square miles—with its bright fringe of harbour cities and network of steamer-lines, Great Britain requires at all times a strong maritime force to represent her. And it is now all the more necessary, as it is becoming daily more and more the chief theatre of commercial traffic, and, as the United States already declare it, an American lake.

The relative weakness of the English navy comes all the more distinctly into view when we fix our eyes on the actual character of naval warfare. In war at sea, as distinguished from war on land, the claims of commerce and private property belonging to the enemy are held to be of minor importance. It is one of the heaviest tasks of the British navy to protect the countless merchant vessels which cover every sea, and are freighted with goods of enormous value.²

It is just owing to this development and extent that English commerce is more exposed to attack than any other; and the history of privateering does not tend to diminish the apprehensions which English merchants entertain on this score. England should remember that in the war of 1812–14 the United States cruisers captured, in the first six months, more than 200 British merchant vessels. Still more fresh in the memory of the English mercantile world are the lessons of the North American war of secession of 1861–5. It remembers how successful were the enterprises of the privateers fitted out by the Southern States, in spite of the fact that they had no development of maritime power, and were at the time blockaded by the fleet of the Union;³ and how the fleet of the Northern States, although at the end of 1863 it had reached a strength which already surpassed that of the French as well as of the English navy, yet did not succeed in putting a stop to the operations of the Southern privateers. It remembers that the marine insurance premium, under the heavy losses which privateering continued to inflict on American commerce, reached such a height that the States of the Union found themselves compelled to denationalise their mercantile fleet. It sailed almost exclusively under the English flag. Under the influence of these reminiscences, great disquietude was aroused in the English mercantile world in 1878 when Russia took steps for

² In the year 1877 the British mercantile fleet numbered 25,733 vessels; the entire import and export amounted in value to 646,765,702*l*.

³ The five comparatively small privateers, *Alabama*, *Georgia*, *Florida*, *Nashville*, and *Tukony*, alone had by the middle of the year 1863 destroyed 125 larger merchant-vessels, including a considerable number of steamers. The *Alabama* in particular, in the three last months of 1862 annihilated no less than 28 large merchant-vessels. The privateer *Tallahassee* counted 15 prizes in 11 days. In vain did the Union Minister of Marine send 12 ships, one after another, in pursuit of her. Finally, when blockaded by cruisers in the harbour of Halifax, when she was taking in coal, she slipped out again, and, after capturing 35 merchant-vessels and carrying on a successful running fight with the blockading squadron, she ran into the harbour of Wilmington in good condition.

equipping cruisers, and with this design purchased the steamers 'Cimbria,' and 'State of California,' as well as the 'Alsatia,' 'Hamornia,' and 'Thuringia' from the Hamburg-American Company. As is well known, the United States of North America did not assent to the declaration of Paris of April 16, 1856, which proclaimed the illegality of privateering. It was remembered in England that the Unionists, embittered by the partiality shown by Great Britain in the war of secession, declared that they should consider themselves justified in equipping an entire fleet of privateers under the flag of Afghanistan or Thibet, on the day on which England should find herself at war with any seafaring people among her Indian neighbours. Such a panic was aroused in the English mercantile world, that it has never yet recovered its feeling of security. Opinion went so far as to look upon the centres of the three Indian presidencies, Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay, as the possible prey of a single bold stroke, and even to take into consideration the eventuality of the Suez Canal being closed. The anxiety of the English mercantile world was certainly in no small degree grounded on the apprehension that England's opponent would meet with the most thoroughgoing support in all parts of the world. The British have had a bad conscience ever since they first exercised their arbitrary power on the seas.

Well might prudent people try to stem that panic by urging that the operations of the Southern cruisers were so successful only because the fleet of the Union was entirely absorbed in the blockade of the Southern coasts: well might they refer to the fact that Great Britain is far the strongest naval power, and that the 'Alabamas' of the future, when chased by English ships of war, will surely have a shorter term of existence granted them than their illustrious predecessor enjoyed. *But even the soberest Englishman came to the conclusion that, in the event of war, the denationalisation of the British mercantile fleet would be the only means of protecting it from destruction.*⁴ The proud queen of the seas sailing under a foreign flag! What Briton of Nelson's days would not blush at the very thought! Could anything show more plainly the enormous change of the times?

But according to the experience of present times, the share which a fleet in general, and the British in particular, may take in the operations of a land army cannot be held a very important one. The

⁴ I refer here to a most valuable article in Colburn's *United Service Magazine*, 1876, 'Our Naval Strength.' It is there stated in so many words:—'If England therefore engages in a war with any European power, the probable result will be a transfer to some neutral flag of a very large portion of our mercantile marine, in order that their employment in the carrying trade might go on uninterruptedly. Shipowners, as a class, would suffer terribly, and the carrying trade of the country would doubtless receive a severe blow from which it would not easily recover: but, except indirectly, other classes would not suffer greatly, and our supplies of food, &c. from without, as well as our exports of all except contraband of war, might go on as if in peace, only in foreign instead of in English ships—or rather, it should be said, in English ships that had been transferred for safety to a foreign neutral flag.'

power of attack by a fleet on foreign coasts has been very much diminished in our times by the progress in the art of fortification, in the science of artillery and submarine mining. The small results obtained in 1854-5 by the English Black Sea fleet, in the North-American Civil war 1861-5, and in the Russo-Turkish war 1877-8 afford abundant evidence that naval expeditions, except when directed to the debarcation of important land forces, possess a very subordinate value. But the development of the means of defence in all European States in the last ten years makes demands at all events, in Europe, on the forces landed, which Great Britain's army could by no means satisfy.

Besides, the introduction of steam into the English navy has to a great extent diminished that prestige which the superiority of her seamen gained for her at a time when navies consisted exclusively of sailing vessels. The introduction of ironclads has diminished the numbers of ships of war, and produced a distinction between men-of-war and merchant vessels, which was undreamt of at the beginning of this century. At that time the merchant navy could to some extent be looked upon as a reserve of the war navy, inasmuch as the adaptation of a merchant vessel to the requirements of warfare did not present any very great difficulty.

Were the case the same at the present day, Great Britain as a naval power could make head against any coalition of Powers; for, as stated above, the tonnage of her sailing vessels bears to that of all other powers combined the proportion of 5,494,577 : 10,535,017, or in round numbers 1 : 2; while the tonnage of steamships is as 2,215,760 : 2,250,461,⁵ in round numbers 1 : 1. Great Britain's fleet of steamers is as strong as that of all other seafaring nations combined.

These proportions, though so remarkably favourable to Great Britain, show clearly how severely she has suffered in point of naval power through the changes in the nature of warships. Against the conversion of mercantile vessels into men of war, besides their sensitiveness to modern artillery and ramming, is also the fact that their construction is too weak to carry the heavy ordnance of the present day. Yet it cannot be denied that England possesses in her mercantile steam navy a valuable resource in case of war. Their wonderful celerity, and their capacity for remaining a long time under steam, insure their manifold and profitable employment in all circumstances. Nevertheless, for purposes of war, the decision must ultimately depend on the numerical strength of the war establishment. The number then of British ships of war bears to that of all other naval powers the proportion of 313 : 1,583,⁴ or roughly 1 : 5; the ironclads included herein being in the proportion of 64 : 244,⁴ or roughly 1 : 4.

It follows, however, from this, that first, the other naval powers

⁵ These numbers refer to the end of 1878.

provide their mercantile marine with a protection numerically three times as powerful as Great Britain does for hers; and secondly, that she has not ventured of late years to create afresh that relative preponderance of which she made so immoderate and indiscreet a use at the beginning of this century. Her first attempt would be followed by the immediate coalition of all naval powers. Of the immense alteration in these proportions Great Britain has already had notice, in the Declaration of Paris, 1856, and the Treaty of Washington, 1871.

It might be supposed that, owing to the wealth of her financial resources, Great Britain could extend her war navy to any limits she thought fit. This, however, is not the case. Of all war *matériel*, maritime appliances are the most sensitive to technical progress. The fact that no one can foresee what weapons of attack or defence the next day may require, and the enormous expenditure entailed by the construction of modern ships of war, make it imperatively necessary even for England to exercise foresight and moderation in the establishment of her war navy.

If we summarise the preceding remarks, we arrive at the following conclusions: at the present day, Great Britain is *absolutely* the strongest naval power; *relatively* as such she is weak. This relative weakness is the result of the dispersion of her ships over the whole world, of the enormous distances which separate the individual squadrons, and of the fact that her base of operations, though of wide extent and all embracing, is yet full of weak points.

The distances which separate the squadrons, and the deficiency of telegraphic communication, exclude the possibility of united co-operation on the part of the scattered portions of the fleet, and expose single squadrons and marine stations to the eventuality of an overwhelming foreign attack. The British war navy can afford so slight a protection to the mercantile fleet, that, in case of war, the latter must be denationalised. The power of attack possessed by the war navy is very much smaller than it was. The united strength of the other powers is, in proportion to Great Britain, greater than ever. The time is past when she, as queen and mistress of the sea, could prescribe rules for other seafaring nations.

From these comparisons, it can cause no surprise that of late English military authorities have been taking into earnest consideration the practicability of an invasion of the United Kingdom.

It must always remain the first and most important task of British military power to protect against invasion the United Kingdom, the heart of the British empire, and central point of its vital system. The opinion held by English military circles on this point appears from the most recent declaration on the subject: namely, from two reports read before the Royal United Service Institution in London, in April 1877, by Admiral Selwyn, their author, General Collinson, R.E., being prevented by illness from appearing in person.

The object of these reports was to make it clear to military, and

especially to political circles, how slight was the security of the island kingdom against invasion.

It is worthy of notice that a superior officer of engineers, entrusted with the system of coast defence, felt himself constrained to bring under discussion the all-important question of an invasion of England; and that a naval officer of high rank, an admiral, became the mouth-piece of a general of the land army.

General Collinson holds that the state of the island kingdom, as far as regards the defence of its coasts, is in a condition not more satisfactory than when it was threatened with invasion by Napoleon I. He is also of opinion that steamers would facilitate an invasion enormously, inasmuch as they make it possible to take the country by surprise. The introduction of ironclads has been followed by a diminution in the number of ships of war—that is to say, a diminution of the means of defence—which again makes an invasion more practicable.

General Collinson bases his calculation on the readiness for action of Germany, France, and Russia. According to his reckoning, within a fortnight there could be embarked, with all supplies necessary for a transmarine invasion, by Germany three, by France four, and by Russia two, army corps of 30,000 men. According to an English officer's calculation, fourteen days would suffice for 50,000 German troops, not merely to be embarked, but also to be landed in England.

As the coast defence of England is virtually entrusted to the fleet, General Collinson investigates its active strength, and furnishes proof that it by no means corresponds to the great hopes placed in it. There are so many difficulties in the way of the equipment of the reserve fleet, that it would be scarcely possible to set 8,500 men in motion for this purpose before the lapse of three months.

Besides, each of the Continental powers mentioned possesses a sufficient number of ironclads to form an escort for her transport fleet, which would be strong enough to make head against the ships of war which—leaving out of count those employed abroad—the English Admiralty can dispose of on the home coasts. Collinson—and as it appears also, his reporter—does not expect that the English fleet could prevent the landing. He represents that instances of English squadrons being surrounded by foreign fleets have occurred tolerably often, and may easily occur again.⁶ Further, he refers to the fact that according to the teaching of the history of war, most landings have been effected successfully; as, for instance, the landing in French Canada in 1758, Bonaparte's, at the mouths of the Nile, in 1798, the landing of the English expedition for the recovery of Egypt in 1801, and that of the French and English in the Crimea, in 1854.⁷

⁶ It is only necessary to recall Nelson's famous chase of the Toulon fleet, which began on the 19th of January, 1805, and lasted, without success, for seven months, till he was finally obliged to put in to Portsmouth.

⁷ The sum total of the troops disembarked by the allies amounted to 63,000 men,

Collinson then admits the probable success of an attempt to effect a landing.

How widely his view that the fleet alone would afford no sufficient protection was shared by persons in authority in England, is shown most convincingly by the fact that, when England was at the zenith of its economical prosperity, at a time when there was an undisguised shrinking from unproductive expenditure, namely, since 1860, more than 10,000,000*l.* has been laid out on coast defence; and that already several plans are extant for transforming London, the giant city with its 3,620,868 inhabitants, into a fortified town like Paris.^a

GREAT BRITAIN AS A LAND POWER.

Collinson admits—as stated already—the success of the landing, and supposes it to take place in the neighbourhood of the mouth of the Thames. All that England could bring forward, to arrest the progress of the hostile advance on the capital, would be at most 50,000 men. A decisive engagement could not long be delayed. A defeat of the English troops in the neighbourhood of London would be decisive as to the occupation of the capital. But with this the most important part of the country, both strategically and politically, falls into the hands of the invader.

Such is General Collinson's opinion. It may, perhaps, be objected that he has painted too gloomy a picture. That a general and an admiral should paint *den Teufel an die Wand*, for the purpose of inducing their countrymen to render their fighting establishment more effective, may be a view worth consideration; but when thoroughly examined, such an argument would be as defective as incorrect.

How so? Is England unable to bring more than 50,000 men to check an enemy advancing from his landing-place on the capital of the country? Are there, then, no more than 100,000 regular troops in the United Kingdom? Cannot the United Kingdom dispose of 113,000 militiamen, 10,500 yeomanry troops, and more than 200,000 volunteers? Would not any invading army be crushed immediately after its landing? Would it not, in a very short time, be cut off from its base and given up to famine?

These objections lead us direct to the investigation of the British military forces.

Collinson's calculation, according to which England could meet an invading army, a few days after its landing, with 50,000 troops

with 128 guns. The French brought the first 20,000 men and 18 guns, with their horses and harness, to land within four hours. Further, the barges and boats conveying the troops had to traverse a considerable space by means of oars. At the present day, when ships of war are provided with steam launches, and transport and mercantile steamers with mechanical appliances for unloading, far better performances may be confidently anticipated.

^a Colonel Drummond Jervois has proposed to surround London with 50 detached works: Major Palliser with 31.

ready for action, is rather too sanguine. The 200,000 volunteers, just as the 10,500 yeomanry troops, cannot, owing to their organisation, equipment, and training, be employed for a regular campaign. Consequently, two-thirds of them were originally destined for coast defence, one-third for garrison service.

The 100,000 militia are, from a military point of view not much more effective. The system is based on the act of 1852, of which the most important clause runs thus: 'The objects of this institution are to be effected with as little pressure as possible on the ordinary occupation of the people.' Their framework of officers (*Chargen-Rahmen*) is of very little value, and their training extremely superficial. As to their ability to march and readiness for action, we may draw a conclusion from the condition of the standing army.

In 1880–81, the standing army in the United Kingdom numbers 101,541 men, composed as follows:

Regimental establishments	83,015
Depôts	13,257
Half of Auxiliary Forces	5,269
	<hr/> 101,541

The sum total of supplementary corps, so far as they were derived from the regular army, amounts only to 16,651 men. For the artillery and cavalry there are absolutely no reserve corps in existence. In time of peace, the English army knows nothing of the higher tactical units—such as brigade, division, corps. The medical, transport, and commissariat departments, have not their full complement even for the reduced establishment. Compared with the great armies of Europe, the English army, considered as an 'army in the field,' is absolutely unorganised.

It follows from this that every mobilisation is accomplished only after enormous friction. The smallest expeditions, such as those against Abyssinia and Ashanti, required months of preparation. In 1878, in the period between the conclusion of the treaty of San Stefano (March 3) and the meeting of the Berlin Congress, Great Britain was not in a position to place in the field a single army corps. In order to calculate the numerical strength of the forces which England could oppose to an invading army a few days after its landing, important considerations are suggested by the dispersion during time of peace of its standing army. On January 1, 1880, it was distributed throughout the United Kingdom as follows:—

There were stationed in England	65,111 men
„ Scotland	3,404 „
„ Ireland	20,248 „
„ the Channel Islands	1,501 „
Total	<hr/> 90,324 „

The fact that in time of peace there should be stationed in Scot-

land, with an area of 1,443 square miles, 3,464 men, but in Ireland, with an area of 1,529 square miles, 20,248, is important for considerations based on the distribution of troops. The numerous risings of which Irish history tells its memories preserved in the history of war (in 1689 the landing of James II. with French troops, in 1793 the appearance of a French fleet, with a landing force of 25,000 men) at so late a period as 1867 the Fenian agitation, and the present social and political condition of Ireland, justify the conclusion that in the event of war the peace garrison of the Emerald Isle would be so shackled, that not only could it not send off a single man for the protection of England, but would rather require a very considerable reinforcement.

The necessity for strong reinforcements in Scotland appears equally indisputable: for it is obvious that the peace establishment of Scotland, 3,464 men strong, would never be sufficient to cover Edinburgh.

On paper there are 65,111 men in the standing army, and 70 per cent. of the first-class army reserve, 16,651 strong, to be employed for the defence of England and Wales, and for reinforcing the garrisons of Scotland and Ireland. From this number we must deduct

Unfit for service	31 per cent.
In hospital	7 „
Deserters	4 „
Under arrest	2 „
Total	44 per cent.

There remain then 48,787 men fit for service. Granting then all conceivable readiness to march and preparedness for action, leaving out of consideration the reinforcement of the garrisons of Scotland and Ireland, admitting even what is practicably impossible, that the entire existing force should be concentrated on one point—in other words, that all other places should be completely denuded of regular troops; yet with all concessions England would not be capable of meeting an invader with 50,000 men.

We see from this that an invading army, far from running any risk of being crushed after a successful landing, would, if consisting of a force of only 50,000 men, have on its side that numerical superiority which is the surest guarantee of success in tactics. This victory would secure to it the possession of London—from a strategical as well as from a political point of view, the most important portion of the country. With London must fall also Woolwich: that is to say, the only war arsenal of the land army would be in the enemy's hands. Owing to the entire absence of any system of inland defence, on the fall of London, Chatham and Portsmouth would at once be threatened: the war harbours, namely, in which Great Britain has almost exclusively concentrated her *matériel* for the equipment of her war fleet.

Finally, the question of feeding the invading army, when closely examined, presents no very great difficulty. The parts of the United Kingdom directly exposed to invasion—namely, the south and south-east of England—are precisely the districts where agriculture and cattle-breeding pre-eminently flourish. The invading army is entering upon a country, one of the richest in all resources in the whole world, and can throughout and for a long time subsist on what the country furnishes. In spite of all, the invasion of Great Britain will remain always a great military problem. That, however, it is possible at the present day is not open to doubt. The protection of the United Kingdom cannot be entrusted to the fleet alone. The British army, however, with which an enemy who had effected a landing would have to cope, is so far behind the requirements of modern warfare in organisation, readiness for marching, and preparedness for war, that any invasion of England is synonymous with an actual surprise.

The declaration of the absolute integrity of Belgium and Holland has a most important bearing on the military security of the United Kingdom. The security of the island kingdom would be in a most critical position, were Holland to be seized by Germany, whose maritime power is so rapidly developing, or Belgium by France, whose position as regards England is at the present day so overwhelmingly strong. Over and over again has France striven for the possession of Antwerp, a harbour capable of holding 1,000 to 1,200 ships. In possession of the mouth of the Scheldt, she would, to use Pitt's expression, hold a pistol at England's breast. Great Britain should be prepared then to come to the assistance of Holland and Belgium at the first note of alarm. The English assistance must come at the very beginning of the invasion and on the very largest scale. We do not doubt that the Belgians, as the Netherlands, would fight for their freedom and independence with the courage of lions. But having regard to the overwhelming superiority of force with which an invading army on the part of the Great Powers, France and Germany, would enter on the theatre of war—to the marvellous celerity with which they are able to mobilise their forces—to the proportionately small territory to be occupied (Belgium, 534·33 square miles, Holland 596·40)—it may be assumed with certainty that within a few days both countries, with the exception of certain strong points, would fall into the hands of the invader.

It was shown by the German-Danish war of 1864 how, in these days, the drama of invading a small state is played out by a superior power—in this case the proportion being only 60,000 : 33,000.

A German invasion of Holland would, at the present day, be accomplished with a rapidity which would surely not fall behind that of the invasions of 1787 and 1795. In fourteen days at the most, after the issue of the order for mobilisation, the German army

columns would cross the frontiers of Holland. Neither the line of the Yssel, nor that of the Grebbe, lying two marches behind it, could arrest the invasion which in two marches further would extend to Utrecht, and with that reach Holland's chief line of defence. In the first fourteen days the Dutch can oppose to this invading army at most 35,000 men in all. In this period all the country east of the Zuyder Zee falls into the hands of the invader. Thus, in all probability, the Dutch army would be deprived of the possibility of collecting its full war establishment of 62,000 men (including the Schutterij); which, supposing the work of mobilisation were undisturbed, could only be carried out in two months at least. It remains then with at most 25,000 men to hold the chief line of defence. It is not inconceivable that the Dutch would abandon this line as being too extended for their forces, and retreat upon the central position of Amsterdam, in which undoubtedly a long resistance is possible.

Belgium, if attacked by France, appears even more defenceless. The years of war 1745, 1792 and 1793, furnish evidence of the speed with which the fate of this country may be decided; the French army under Gérard, which crossed the Belgian frontier November 15, 1832, appeared before Antwerp four days later, on the 19th, and that city capitulated December 23.

A French invasion of Belgium would be a farce of the same character. The fact that in 1832 the Belgians received the French as friends, while to-day they would oppose them as enemies, has but a slight bearing on the result; inasmuch as the Belgian army (whose war establishment is 99,851 men), must, in presence of an overwhelming invasion, content itself with a retreat upon the entrenched camp of Antwerp, and remain in the district of Termonde-Malines-Lierre, Antwerp. This, and an attitude of defence in anticipation of help from England, constitutes the entire system on which Belgium's safety rests.

We see, then, the Dutch, as well as the Belgians, in a few days after the invading army has crossed their frontier, thrown back upon their central position, and there beleaguered by overwhelming forces. Would they be able to make a stand? Would England be able to come to the rescue?

This last question leads us to determine next *what military strength Great Britain could put forth outside the limits of the United Kingdom.*

The volunteers, yeomanry, and militia, independently of their usefulness for a campaign, cannot be employed in a war abroad, as they are not enlisted for foreign service. To this last purpose it is the standing army exclusively which is applicable. As in no case can a diminution of the peace establishment in Ireland be thought of, so even supposing Great Britain to call up its regular army to the last man, it can only dispose of a maximum of 70,000 men, or two

army corps, for active service. Even supposing it to place the whole of this force in Belgium and Holland, it could effect no change in the fate of these small States. But in the event of war against France and Germany, the danger of an invasion of England would become so serious and pressing that the latter would require every man for the defence of its own soil, and would be unable to dream of offensive undertakings abroad. She must, whether she will or not, abandon Belgium and Holland to their fate.

The defensive condition of the *colonial possessions* of Great Britain is still less favourable than that of the United Kingdom itself. There are three forces which render their defence difficult: the enormous superficial area and population of the British colonial possessions; the circumstance that they are not united in one compact whole, but scattered over the entire world; and, lastly, the weakening effect produced by great distances.

We learn from history how enormous distances, separating colonies from the mother country, weaken all military action entered on by the latter on behalf of the former.

In spite of a struggle lasting eight years, full of the greatest efforts, England was unable to prevent the separation of the present 'United States,' which counted at that period not more than 3,000,000 inhabitants. Again, in the two years' war of 1812-14, Great Britain did not succeed in getting the upper hand against the young and as yet weak republic. In St. Domingo the negroes fought for and succeeded in gaining their freedom against mighty England as well as against powerful France.

Spain and Portugal have been, equally with England, incapable of retaining their American possessions. Just as Buenos Ayres had previously thrown off the Spanish yoke in 1806, so between 1810 and 1825, in spite of the efforts of Spain, Columbia, Peru, La Plata, Uruguay, Chili, and Bolivia, Paraguay and Mexico freed themselves, while Cuba and Porto Rico alone remained to the Spanish Crown.

This truth is further confirmed by the history of late years. In a similar manner, Napoleon III., who had determined to create a monarchy in Mexico in the expectation that the civil war would lead to the break-up of the States of North America, was obliged to abandon the American expedition immediately on the United States demanding the recall of the French troops at the conclusion of the civil war.

It was only in February of last year that the insurrection in Cuba, which broke out in October 1868, reached a temporary end. It has obliged Spain to send in a single year since King Alphonso's accession 24,445 soldiers to Cuba. The memorandum of the Spanish Government of February 14, 1876, from which these figures are derived, states that the number of native insurgents never exceeded 1,000.

On the evidence, then, of the history of the wars of the past century, it appears that no European power—not excepting even the great naval powers, France and England—can bring a crushing military force into action in the New World.

The United States, above any other power, exercise in questions affecting the New World a decisive influence, both military and political. In just recognition of this truth, France under the First Consul sold Louisiana to the United States in 1803; and Spain followed this example with Florida in 1819.

It is self-evident that this is equally true *vice versâ*. On their side as well the United States are unable to throw into the scale in Europe any considerable military force. It is true that in 1815 an American fleet punished the piratical State of Algiers; but, on the other hand, all attempts to obtain possession of an island in the Mediterranean, as a permanent port for protection of their commerce, have failed through the protests of England.

The recognition of the impossibility of protecting the colonies in a serious war by reinforcements from the mother country has given the latter the hint to put them on a military footing of their own. How far this design has been carried out hitherto shall be discussed in its proper place.

Let us next fix our attention on the American colonies possessed by England—namely, the Union of Canada, Newfoundland, Prince Edward's Island, the Bermudas, and Bahamas, fifteen of the small Antilles, and Jamaica, Honduras, and British Guiana. All these colonies come so far within the range of the power of the United States, predominant in both Americas, that England cannot think of protecting the continental part of them at all events against the Union. The grounds of this assertion are—that while these colonies are separated from the mother country by a vast ocean (from Liverpool to Quebec it is 2,634 nautical miles, and from Southampton to St. Thomas 3,570), they are within arm's length of the great Republic.

The military protection which the mother country could afford its American colonies is very insignificant. According to the calculation of the Budget for 1880–81, only a single garrison is kept up in the Dominion of Canada, whose area is 153,745 square miles, and population 4,127,526. There are stationed in Halifax only 1,843 English troops. Besides these, Bermuda is garrisoned by 2,158; the other West Indian Islands by 2,361 men—namely, 81 in the Bahamas, 196 in Honduras, 885 in Jamaica, 1,182 in the Windward and Leeward Islands. This protection, then, is merely nominal. On the other hand, it has induced the Dominion of Canada to do something for its own defence. In 1868, in consequence of the differences with the United States and the Fenian outbreak, it called into existence the militia for the defence of the country. It embraces all subjects

from eighteen to sixty years of age, and is divided into the active and the reserve militia. The first, which has alone received some military training, numbers 45,152 men; as reserve it is supposed to be able to dispose of the tremendous number of 655,000 men!

The African colonial possessions of Great Britain seem to be in a more secure position than the American. They comprise Gambia, Sierra Leone, the Gold Coast, Lagos, Cape Colony, Natal, Transvaal, Ascension Island, St. Helena, Tristan da Cunha, Mauritius and its dependencies, St. Paul and New Amsterdam. These colonies seem in a safer position, because in those parts of the Dark Continent in which England has a firm foothold she has at the moment no European rival to fear; while against the natives and the Boers she can bring to bear the overwhelming weight of her wealth and civilisation, and of European military science. Great Britain looks upon Africa as the prize of the commerce of the future, as the great area of consumption which will compensate her for the loss of the European and American market. To this point also the numerous exploring expeditions. The recent war against the Zulu-Kaffirs, and the attempts of France and Italy to gain a footing in Africa, show clearly that if England wishes to maintain and extend her colonial possessions in Africa, she requires in this continent as well a strong military representation.

The fact that Plymouth and the Cape of Good Hope are separated by 5,780 nautical miles must have a very weakening effect on any action originating in the mother country. The Government was, therefore, desirous to relieve the colonies, especially the Cape, from military dependence on the mother country.

But hitherto the colonists have not shown much zeal in seconding the Government in this endeavour. In these African colonies, with a total area of 10,839 square miles, and a population of 1,367,000 souls, there are stationed, according to the calculations of the Budget for 1880-81, 6,697 men in all—namely, 5,386 in Cape Colony, including Natal; 228 at St. Helena, 458 at the Mauritius, 429 at Sierra Leone, and 196 on the Gold Coast and at Lagos.

The third and most important group of English colonial possessions comprises the British colonies in Asia and Australia. We may conveniently speak of them as a single group, because a single route connects them with the mother country—that, namely, by which the commerce of the world passes through the Suez Canal. This group is the most important one for England, as on its possession is grounded England's dominating position in the Indian Ocean, as well as in the Pacific. It is the inexhaustible source of the economical prosperity, of the thriving and successful condition of the mother country. The enormous importance of these colonial possessions is shown—if not fully, yet very remarkably—by the figures of the commercial transactions between them and the mother country. In

1877 imports and exports together reached the colossal total of 151,000,000*l.* sterling.

Of this great group the Australian colonies—namely, the entire continent and the islands Tasmania, Norfolk, New Zealand, the Fanning and the Fiji group, 144,760 square miles in area, with 1,720,475 inhabitants—are, from a military point of view, in a tolerably secure situation. Of the Australian, as of the African colonies of England, Montesquieu's view holds good, that their extreme remoteness from the mother country has not a prejudicial effect on their security. 'As the mother country is too distant to protect them, so are her enemies and rivals too far off to conquer them.'

There is no power at the present day which would have a sufficiently strong interest and the power to endanger England's colonies in this part of the world. As, however, the possibility is by no means excluded that Melbourne, New Zealand, Sydney, Adelaide, Brisbane, Auckland, Dunedin, Fiji, and Vancouver's Land might receive some passing damage, the mother country, while ceasing to garrison the Fiji Islands, as hitherto, with ninety-six men, has seconded endeavours which have led to Australia's military separation being partially accomplished. The New South Wales colony has already some troops of its own to dispose of, and is on the point of creating a fleet.

Let us turn now to England's colonial possessions in Asia. Aden, Perim, Ceylon, the Straits Settlements (Singapore, Penang, the territory of Malacca), Hong Kong, and Labuan, are, without doubt, very important stations; but in comparison with the Indian Empire, whose importance far outweighs all remaining British colonies united, they need hardly be taken into consideration.

In the Indian Empire, its most costly possession, Great Britain finds itself threatened in a twofold manner—from within and from without. To be able to estimate fully the greatness of this menace, we must fix our attention more closely on the circumstances of British India.

With that steady regard for material gain which characterises the Anglo-Saxon race, England has had firm foothold on the soil of Further India—the Italy of the East—for nearly 300 years. Up to the middle of last century her progress was fairly moderate; since then it has been very great. By vigorous and fortunate wars, and by prudently turning to account the enmities of weak native Princes, she has made herself by the present time, with the exception of some small possessions, mistress of the whole of Further India. She rules now over an area of 70,000 square miles, or 4,187,000 square kilometres, with a population of 240,000,000 souls. The East India Company and its legal successor, the Crown of Great Britain, laid hold of this costly prize in a spirit quite different from that of Alexander, the mighty King of Macedon. India was and is to them a milch-cow,

which supplies England with butter. The necessary consequence of the British system of self-enrichment is the material ruin of India. It is true that Great Britain has restored internal peace to Further India, has laid out roads to develop agriculture, has executed enormous irrigation works, has built 11,300 kilometres of railways, and—last, not least—has founded an Anglo-Mohammedan university in India. She has, however, completely destroyed native manufactures, has tried to reap enormous crops without manuring the soil (den Raubbau ohne genügende Düngung provocirt), has burdened the country with intolerable taxation, and introduced the village money-lender, with his 12, 24, or 60 per cent. While every year there come from India to England 20,000,000*l.* of British profits, Indian society under British rule is impoverished to a frightful extent. The investment of capital is not known in India; all monetary transactions take place through English gold. The finances of the Indian Empire have for a long time been very unsatisfactory. In the last twenty years India has had a deficit sixteen times, and the sum total of the deficits in the last four financial years reached nearly 21,000,000*l.*; 45 per cent. of the total revenue is taken up with military expenditure. The British system of government in India has brought its fruit. The priests, Hindu as well as Mohammedan, the military party and those who have received a political education, the native warriors and chieftains who have been dispossessed, and finally, the mob, are irreconcilably hostile to England. How little trust the British Government places in the native Princes may be gathered from the fact that in the spring of 1878—at a time, that is, when the outbreak of war with Russia was imminent—it took steps for the reduction of the armies of these native Princes, which together number 305,235 men, with 5,252 guns. The very moderate *Bombay Gazette* wrote plainly:—‘The armies of the native Princes are an open threat to the British power in India.’ Revolution was so openly preached by the Indian daily press, and the people, by its means, so goaded on to a struggle with their foreign masters, that the Viceroy found himself in 1878 forced to suppress the liberty of the press.

From these circumstances it can cause no surprise that all statesmen who return home from India own without disguise to the most pessimistic views. Rawlinson states plainly that England is in truth standing on a volcano in India, which may burst forth in eruption any day and annihilate British supremacy.

In its Indian Empire, resting on so insecure a basis, Great Britain has long found herself daily threatened by greater dangers from without, on the part of the greatest continental power in the world—namely, Russia.

In the course of this sketch it has been shown that Great Britain could not defend by military force its continental possessions in

America against the United States, because in an attack on Canada the United States could bring to bear an enormous military preponderance, which would not be weakened by having to traverse vast distances and an entire ocean, as must be the case with any military action on the part of Great Britain. Similar, though far more dangerous from Great Britain's point of view, are the circumstances we find in Asia.

As in the former the 'Union' is Canada's neighbour, so here Russia forms the neighbour of the Indian Empire. At present, indeed, the contact is not direct: Afghanistan still lies as a buffer between the two rivals. But Great Britain has already gone to war with Afghanistan for the third time, to prevent its falling under Russian influence. The direct contact of the two rivals will sooner or later be an accomplished fact. A collision between the two is inevitable, as matters are here situated differently for Great Britain to what they are on the American continent.

The North American Union is not an aggressive power, as at the present day nothing exists which she can desire. Her body of States unites in itself all the necessary conditions of that unprecedented material prosperity which excites the just admiration of the world. In the enormous expanse which it occupies between the two oceans within the frontiers of the Union, countless important problems, tasking the powers of generations, lie awaiting their solution. It is with the implements of the arts of peace that the United States are building up the fabric of their greatness. Peace is, indeed, especially their policy.

Russia, on the other hand, is a State overmastered and driven forward by a marvellous power of expansion. The empire, which at the time of its foundation by Peter the Great was almost an inland State, has since pushed forward its frontiers to the Baltic and the Black Sea. Proceeding against its neighbours with the mathematical regularity of the blockade of a fortress, it has swallowed up Finland, Ingria, Esthonia, Livonia, Courland, Lithuania, Congress-Poland, Bialystock, Volland, Podolia, part of Ukraina, Bessarabia, the Crimea, Taurida, Kuban, the Caucasus, Georgia, and Armenia; annexed about 50,000 square miles in Central Asia, enlarged the Amoor territory, set a firm foot on Sachalin in the farthest East, and, what is most important of all, has not yet reached that for which it must always strive—the free entrance on the free sea, the commercial thoroughfare of the world. For a State of 21,500,000 square kilometres (330,000 square miles), and 85,200,000 souls, the free entrance on the free sea is, in the truest sense of the word, a condition of existence. As the Arctic Ocean is without importance as regards the commerce of the world, while the entrance to the Sea of Okhotsk and the Behring's Straits is quite inaccessible; the Sound and the Bosphorus (the latter the real mouth of all the great rivers

of Russia) are in foreign hands, and can at any moment be closed. It is a simple fact that the Empire of Russia is even at the present day breathing through foreign air-channels. Such a condition is, as a lasting one, intolerable, and we can therefore understand that Russia makes the greatest efforts to change it to her own advantage.

There are three roads which lead Russia towards this longed-for goal. The pursuit of the first, aiming at the possession of the Baltic Sound, would precipitate a struggle which Russia does not feel herself capable of carrying through with success. The second leads to Constantinople. Russia has already trodden this road again and again; but always in vain. She has always found united Europe stand to oppose her advance along this road. Even the last victorious war confirms the expressions used in 1868 by an Austrian officer of high rank, in a pamphlet on the subject:—

All the struggles on the Danube and the Balkans are lost labour. The whole direction of her policy toward the Aja Sophia is a mistake. Russia's road towards the conquest of Constantinople leads across Austria, which presses with the whole weight of her military strength directly or indirectly upon the strategic defile between the Carpathians and the Black Sea.

Taking into consideration these hindrances and the prospect of a war with a European coalition, Russia will most probably in the future seek to give expression to her yearnings for the open sea on the Asiatic side, as the main point of pressure.

The entrance to the Indian Ocean through the Persian Gulf opens the world to Russia. This direction is moreover in perfect harmony with her political ideal (*Staats-Idee*), which has been expressed by one of her clearest heads, General Heinrich Antonowitsch Leer, in almost the following words:—

Every nation that has been organised into a polity has a mission of its own. It was in fulfilment of hers that Russia acted as the bulwark of Europe against the Tartars, against an inroad of fresh peoples, and thus saved the civilisation of Western Europe from a repetition of the devastations of the fifth century. But Russia's mission is not complete with that; she has the task of rendering the civilisation of Western Europe accessible to the peoples of Asia. The military tasks of Russia follow in natural sequence from this political programme; namely, a defensive attitude towards the West, and an offensive advance towards the East.

The great programme of the Russian Empire may be stated thus: 'entrance on the open sea, through the Persian Gulf to the Indian Ocean, which opens the world to us.' In carrying out this programme it must encounter the resistance of Great Britain. Recognising that this great programme can only be realised through blood and iron, Russia has accepted universal conscription. With the incalculable resources she possesses in a population of 85,000,000 souls, she will at her own time proceed to the solution of the question, affecting the whole world, of the mastery in Asia. Will England be able to withstand the onset of the Colossus of the North?

We see, then, that England's greatest colonial acquisition is also, from a military point of view, the most precarious. The circumstance that Bombay is 6,779 nautical miles distant from Liverpool obliged the mother country at a very early period to place the East Indian colonies on their own military footing.

As the number of Europeans resident in India is but very insignificant (according to the census of 1871, 64,061 souls), these could not form the basis of Indian military strength. European troops have always been stationed in India, as guardians of the Indian Empire. As these have never sufficed numerically for the requirements, the English at an early period made use of the suitable native element for military service. In 1877-8 the Anglo-Indian Government had the following military force at its disposal:—

1. English troops ordered to India	62,653 men
2. Regular native troops, namely, the armies of Madras, Bombay, and Bengal together	125,871 „
		<hr/>
	In all	188,524 „

Further, the Government encourages the formation of volunteer corps of Englishmen resident in India.

The Anglo-Indian army is above all charged with the task of upholding English supremacy in India; that is to say, preserving internal quiet in the English provinces, and giving security to the Governments of the dependent States. It is in consequence not so much an army for use against a foreign enemy as a militarily organised police force. How proportionately weak it is even as such, is seen when we find that for every area of 66·83 square kilometers ($\frac{4 \cdot 187 \cdot 000}{3 \cdot 3 \cdot 3 \cdot 3}$) or for every 3,830 natives ($\frac{240000 \cdot 000}{3 \cdot 3 \cdot 3 \cdot 3}$) there is but one English soldier. The last proportion, if applied to European capitals, would give as garrison to Paris 483, Vienna 218, Berlin 215, Petersburg 174, and Rome 64 men. What Government would dare to realise this proportion?

We see from this how necessarily the English troops in particular are bound to the soil of the Indian Empire. For military purposes without the frontiers of India, not even a small fraction of them need come under consideration. As, however, in a struggle with a European foe the native troops are not to be relied upon, the necessity of abundant assistance on the part of the mother country is fully obvious. Will England be able to afford it? and in what strength? and when?

A strategical review of the British colonial empire teaches us that not a single colony can in military respects walk alone. Their peace establishments are so tiny, that the military protection afforded them is only nominal. All the colonies without exception are dependent on aid from the mother country, which alone has the disposal of such troops as may be at hand and of the material for transport requisite for their embarkation; and which may be

looked upon as the central reserve post of imperial defence from which, in case of need, stream forth reinforcements to the colonies. If then we consider how manifold are the purely defensive tasks alone of these 70,000 men, which under the best circumstances the United Kingdom has at its disposal; when we keep before us the insuperable difficulties which beset the moral mastery of a theatre of war extending over the whole world; when we keep in view the weakening effect of the immense distances to which are subject all operations for reinforcement; when, lastly, we fix our attention upon the antagonist with whom Great Britain must eventually struggle; we see in full clearness the enormous disproportion between the organised military power of Great Britain and the tasks which await it.

CONCLUDING REMARKS.

If, however, Great Britain is unable to defend its territorial integrity against foreign attack, far less can it hinder those alterations of power in the political world which great powers may endeavour to bring about, who in pursuit of their design are determined to have recourse to the *ultima ratio*. England was unable to prevent the separation of Schleswig-Holstein from Denmark; she cannot protect Belgium and Holland; she is utterly unable to defend the wide territory of Turkey against the assault of Russia, which the treaty of June 4, 1878, binds her to do. In just recognition of the inadequacy of British military power for operations abroad, the *Army and Navy Gazette* wrote in May 1875: 'We see that foreign States are advancing with great strides in the reorganisation of their armies and the perfection of their weapons, in adding legion to legion, and straining every nerve to expedite their mobilisation. While they work out beforehand even the smallest detail, we must admit that, in comparison with other continental powers, we have absolutely no army at all. Our few battalions, without reserves, which must be crumpled up together, to bring them up to a war footing, are so weak, that the threat of appearing with them on a European theatre of war would be greeted with scornful laughter from the Pyrenees to the Neva.' *The recognition of the military impotence of the Empire, in attack as well as in defence, is the key to Great Britain's foreign policy since the Crimean war.* This recognition is the ultimate ground of that 'policy of non-intervention,' that 'masterly inactivity' which Gladstone once represented: as well as of the policy of half-measures and haggling to which Beaconsfield was condemned—a policy which, as was strikingly remarked by a member of Parliament, 'began useless wars against the weak, and trembled before the strong,'—and of the policy of the Naval Demon-

stration, the first act of which found a glorious termination in the surrender of Dulcigno. '*Parturiunt montes, nascetur ridiculus mus.*'

In the two last decades Great Britain has suffered the most important alterations of power to take place; alterations which have on each occasion diminished the weight of her influence. The breaking-up of the Austrian authority in Italy and Germany has certainly not strengthened the political importance of Great Britain. In Italy she has bred up a rival rather than an ally, and has certainly not extended the sphere of her moral influence in France. Great Britain's rival in the New World, the North American Union, has come forth stronger than ever, from a civil war which threatened her existence: a fact which involves the most important consequences, both commercial and political.

Germany has become the first power in the European concert, and, having become also a naval power through the possession of Schleswig-Holstein, must soon reckon with Great Britain. In the farthest East, on the shores of the Pacific Ocean, she is already, in commerce, England's most formidable competitor. But the alterations which are most dubious for Great Britain are those which have accomplished themselves in the East since the Crimean war. For the most important English interest, the commercial policy, it is scarcely possible to conceive a more favourable state of affairs than that produced by the Crimean war. Inasmuch as Russia, by the peace of Paris, gave up the mouths of the Danube together with a piece of territory, relinquished all claim to the one-sided Protectorate over Christians in Turkey and over the Danubian Principalities, restored Kars, promised not to establish any arsenal on the Black Sea, and not to station there more ships than the Porte, she recognised the superiority of the Western powers in the East.

The Western powers had rescued Turkey from the ruin which threatened her, and which she could not have escaped without their help. No wonder, then, that Turkey acknowledged the influence of the Western powers, and before all that of England. Turkey—too weak either to live, or to die—always needed foreign assistance, and became the true element of English diplomacy, of English commercial spirit. So long as Turkey preserved intact her territorial integrity, she was the welcome 'buffer' between England and Russia. It was owing to the wide extent of Turkey and the military capacity of the Osmanli people, that Russia could never, without a great war, reach the point at which British interests would be directly touched, the point in possession of which Russia could endanger England's great political and military route to the far East, the sources of her wealth and power. Great Britain was pre-eminently the State which had the most vital interest in securing the permanency of the arrangement of the Eastern world created by the peace of Paris. But what alterations have come to pass since then! Russia has completely subjugated the

mountain tribes of the Caucasus, 'the guardians of the Indian empire,' has arbitrarily repudiated the stipulations of the peace of Paris referring to the Black Sea, has stepped over its glacis (off the Caucasus), is lord of Batum, Ardahan, and Kars, and thus has advanced seriously nearer the Suez Canal. Russia is again mistress of the mouths of the Danube, *de facto* protector of Roumania, Bulgaria, Servia, and Montenegro. In the South she has laid mines beneath the Balkans, which are a perpetual threat to Turkey, inasmuch as they may explode at any moment. Russia has ruined Turkey for ever, both militarily, politically, and materially. Russia has since advanced from the Syr-Darja to the Amu-Darja, and her influence over the whole Eastern world has become enormous.

How has Great Britain behaved in presence of all these shiftings of power? She has, in due appraisal of her military impotence, refrained with good judgment from appealing to the sword, the last and most extreme measure of policy. She has confined herself exclusively to political and diplomatic action, and consequently, in the North American war of Secession and in the Alabama question, in the German-Danish war of 1864, in the Franco-German war, and in the Black Sea question, in the last Russo-Turkish war, and later she has played a really lamentable part. It can cause no surprise that Great Britain's position as regards foreign policy has fallen ever lower and lower since the Crimean war. In this century of statistics it is impossible to keep secret the ultimate ground for so feeble an appearance presented by a power that at one time interfered so vigorously in the destinies of the political world—namely, the military impotence of England. Military book-keeping and military arithmetic have advanced too far to admit delusions as to the effective power of any State. The universal recognition of the military impotence of England, and her consequent sanction of political and diplomatic action alone, even in the most weighty political questions, has been followed by one important result—the discontinuance of that deference of the cabinets—that awe which England used to inspire in the cabinets of other nations, which was the offspring in particular of the Napoleonic wars, and survived to our times. But it was only a single step from the cessation of this cabinet-respect to the loss of all weighty influence on the destinies of our planet.

Here, however, we find the key to the remarkable fact, that all attempts which England has made of late years to qualify herself by means of alliances for a policy depending on material strength, have met with so miserable a failure. In France, as in Germany, the siren voices of England have awakened only a mocking echo. One of the most notable signs of the times lies in the fact that even that power which has ever been most susceptible to English influence, Austria herself, rejected the British alliance at a moment when its acceptance seemed an act of self-preservation, and at the same

time opened up the most seductive vista in the future. It is not, however, difficult to understand how this occurred. The statesman who ruled Austria could not help saying to himself, that the shares of the capital deposited in this joint-stock company would be too unequal, and, as far as Austria was concerned, in no proportion to the gains to be expected. He had to say to himself that England could contribute as good as nothing for decisive, i.e. military action; that Austria alone must bear the entire burden of all military undertakings. That Austria, pressing upon the Moldo-Wallachian defile with 1,200,000 men, was in a position alone to solve that problem, did not admit of the smallest doubt. But a war with Russia would have cost 150,000,000*l.*, a sum which England would not have willingly offered for the purpose, even though a great State of 37,000,000 souls and a whole people in arms offered their neck to the hangman in return for the subsidies. There remains, then, still England's moral support. How trustworthy and valuable this is, who does not know! Truly Austria has good grounds to congratulate herself that on this one occasion she laid to heart the teaching of the past, and did not again pull the chestnuts out of the fire for England. To-day—to be sure, it is only to-day—England is doing this for Russia. Would it be possible to find a more apt illustration of the proverb, '*Les extrêmes se touchent*'?

Taking a survey of Great Britain's position as regards foreign policy, we find that at the present day it has not a single ally it can count upon, to take its side in the tremendous and inevitable conflict which must decide the question of the Eastern world. Herein, however, lies one of the radical differences between the past and the present.

It was an easy task to give life to the coalition of Europe against the ideas which menaced all existing institutions of the first French Republic, and its son and heir, the terrible oppressor of nations: easy to lead the way into the struggle and never relinquish it 'till justice were accomplished.'

These circumstances of the political world, so peculiar and so extremely favourable to England, preserved her from the danger, which had so often threatened her, of a struggle for existence: as the allied powers, who supplied the actual armies, completely absorbed the energies of France. It sufficed that England, for her share, should contribute auxiliary troops and subsidies.

All is changed now. It is easy to foresee that Russia, once she has seized on the mastery in Asia, will exercise an enormous pressure on Europe, now no longer young. But to all appearance this danger lies too far off, and the States of Europe are occupied by questions lying so much nearer to hand, for the supposition to be entertained that they would be inclined to make very early preparation to oppose a State which, fulfilling its mission in the East, has for more than

half a century acted on its western frontier strictly on the defensive. In the East, however—in Central and Eastern Asia—no European State has interests vital enough to make it join England in the struggle. Turkey alone, whose military and political constitution is sapped, and which is hastening to its ruin with giant strides, will perhaps range its power on the side of the British.

The British empire, then, must eventually be exclusively limited to the power of the United Kingdom.

And this empire, now reduced to the power it can call forth from itself alone, must before long incur the risk of a struggle for existence: and herein lies the second radical difference between the past and the present; as who can doubt that the inevitable struggle for the mastery in Asia is for England a struggle for existence!

Without a position of ascendancy in the East, the British Empire cannot be maintained for any length of time. With India, England remains the dominating power in Asia. The loss of India would be followed by the most terrible consequences for England. It was by force that the unprecedented empire, which the Anglo-Saxon race has built up in the course of three centuries, was founded: it is by force alone that it can be maintained.

The loss of India, her greatest and costliest possession, would be the most unmistakable proof of England's impotence and inability to preserve her integrity. This loss would inevitably entail that of her other colonies. Fulfilling already the conditions of self-existence, they all have an interest in belonging to the British Empire just so long as it, in virtue of its great position, ensures them the most trustworthy military protection, and a place in the front rank of the commerce of the world.

The dominion of Canada, the Cape Colony, Australia, and New Zealand would probably shake themselves free on the day on which Great Britain lost possession of India.

As, however, the existence of the United Kingdom is founded on industry and commerce, as it is based on a colonial empire which embraces about one-seventh of the territorial extent of the globe, and nearly one-fourth of its inhabitants—a colonial empire whose superficial area is sixty times as great as that of the mother country—with the loss of India the entire artificial structure of its economy, nay England itself, would fall to pieces.

The wonder that England, which in the density of her population, in the magnitude and complexity of her social life, and the gigantic size of her towns, possesses more material for a social conflagration than perhaps any other country, while the informality of her public life and the insignificance of her bureaucratic and military establishments afford but very slight means for quenching it,—the wonder that England has hitherto remained free from the fever of socialism can be accounted for in many natural ways; the most important reason,

however, lies in the fact that up to the present day England has been the farmer-general of the profits of the world.

That England is unable to preserve in perpetuity the *status quo* in Asia with the forces it possesses now, requires no proof.

It is, however, filled with the belief that its wealth will provide it in case of need with the means of making legions spring from the earth. In this belief in the almighty power of gold—to which the great majority of Englishmen pay blind homage—it entirely fails to apprehend the change of the times, the power, resistless as an element, which modern warfare has at its command, and the requirements which it makes of an army. The days of recruited armies are over. They can neither in number nor quality suffice for the requirements of modern warfare. But even supposing that from point of numbers they were to suffice, and that other classes in England besides the non-propertyed classes were to obey the summons to the colours in sufficient numbers, yet this would never provide more than new formations. The history of the North American war—in which new formations were opposed to new formations—has made it sufficiently clear with what fearful birth-throes an army is created by a people that has not possessed a military organisation suited to the times, and part of the national life. Even if, as is most improbable, the course of modern warfare which in a few weeks overthrows military powers of the first rank should leave England time to form these new troops, still these new formations would everywhere find the old ones obstacles in their path. What the former must in such a case expect, has been abundantly shown by the catastrophe of Bourbaki's army; which, although struggling against Werder with a force three times as strong, was crushed as against a *rocher de bronze*.

The days of improvisation and dilettantism in military matters are over, and herein lies the third great difference between the Past and the Present. The German victories of 1870 were not the result of an improvisation, but of long sustained work.

Since the Peace of Tilsit (writes Leer^o with truth) the solution of this military problem [the struggle with France] has been worked at, and truly in an exemplary manner, by several generations of Prussian statesmen, from Stein, Scharnhorst, and Gneisenau to Bismarck, Moltke, and Roon. In this, in previous preparation in every direction, with the utmost diligence, perseverance, and patience, is to be found not only the most important and primary reason of all the great successes of the late war, but also the source of all that is truly great in every department of the Prussian Government's activity.

At the present time the English people lacks all appreciation of this great truth, so far as it applies to military questions. The deficiency of this appreciation, however, is one of the most real hindrances

* *Über die Wichtigkeit der Vorbereitung zum Kriege, &c.* by H. A. Leer, Major-General, Professor at the Nikolai General Staff Academy (Organ of the Union of Military Science, vol. xiv. p. 451).

to the carrying out of any system of military reform based upon universal liability to service. This can cause no surprise. Since the battle of Culloden, that is to say since 1746, the soil of the Island Kingdom, thanks to its watery rampart, has been trodden by no foreign foe.

The overthrow of Napoleon, greeted in Great Britain more than in any other country as a brilliant triumph, has engendered in the English people a feeling of security which alone would suffice to put a stop to all development of military power. In addition to this, the long duration of the war and the enormous subsidies paid to the allies, weakened its forces. During the struggle England had not been sensible of any diminution of them; now, however, the exhaustion was all the more keenly felt. Reaction raised its head more threateningly than ever. The power of the Government and the pretensions of the aristocracy had increased in proportion as the standing army had been enlarged. To break the power of the Government and the aristocracy, the attempt was made on principle, and by every means, to discredit the military element. 'The English people had placed all its hopes on the time when the green olive branch of peace should flourish all over the earth.' This peace, an unexampled peace of nearly forty years, came, and brought—after a hard struggle against the persons and classes exceptionally favoured by traditional law or the existing principles of the constitution—freedom and prosperity such as has seen no parallel. The millennium seemed to have dawned. The nations, it was said, desired nothing more warmly, 'than to live in mutual sentiments of genial brotherhood:' the progress of industry and the extension of commerce, so it was preached, demanded imperiously the abandonment of all frontiers to land and sea; war, it was said, should be a custom as absurd as barbarous in international intercourse; let the time for standing armies be for ever past, and the whole world unite in the single cry of Peace!

For more than half a century, then, the political and still more the economical development of England has made it impossible to foster her military power. Besides, the old principle of universal liability to service had vanished in the course of a century from the consciousness of the people. Even the militia had fallen into oblivion, and, although revived by statute in 1852, had drooped again after the Crimean War. The warlike spirit of the English people has completely vanished. The English army is formed on the system of recruiting by bounty. If, however, a State with an astonishingly developed industry and an immeasurable commerce has recourse to recruiting, it must be inevitably thrust into the background in the men-market by industrial and commercial undertakings: it is only the pauper class, which is physically and morally most backward, the class which takes to service finally only out of despair—consequently the class of least value from a military point of view—which comes into the army.

It can, then, cause no surprise, that in humanitarian England cor-

poral punishment was quite lately stigmatised in Parliament¹⁰ as an intolerable means of preserving discipline; and it is understood that—as in 1877 for instance, no less than 7,500 men could desert from the numerically insignificant army of the mother country—it is being taken into earnest consideration in England whether the branding of deserters by means of tattoo-marks should not be introduced afresh.

Finally, up till quite lately, with a few exceptions applying to the scientific corps and the marines, promotion from the rank of lieutenant upwards was procurable by purchase. But it is obvious that at a time when every day opens up fresh vocations for talent and industry, new sources of activity, and opportunities for speedy success, all talent would throw itself into civil pursuits, and superior men would no more enter upon the military calling.

Under these circumstances, it can cause no surprise that the military profession sank ever more and more in estimation, and even became despised; that the soldier was completely deprived of that national honour which he receives elsewhere; that the English people looked upon its army as something quite distinct from itself; and that the consciousness of the great function of the army in the State and its ethical importance in the nation is completely lost.

The nineteenth century development of the nature of war has completely escaped not only the English people but also its most prominent intellects. Neither the one nor the other has in the least grasped the enormous alteration in the intrinsic nature of war, that has been accomplished in the great continental States—an alteration which, as was strikingly remarked by Lorenz von Stein, is perhaps the greatest fact of our century, far outweighing all others in its consequences.

Yet Henry Thomas Buckle, undoubtedly one of the most remarkable spirits of later England, misconceives war as exclusively a brutal act of force, and places the military classes in formal contradiction to the intelligent, saying that 'the contrast then between these and the military classes is clear: it is the contrast between thought and action, between the within and the without, between argument and force, between Persuasion and Bodily Strength, or, in a word, between men who live by the arts of peace and those who live by war.'

The idea that war, in following out always its tendency towards that which is most without (*die Tendenz zum Aeussersten*), claims the highest services from thought as well as action, from the within as

¹⁰ On the 26th of March 1878, Mr. O'Connor Power, M.P., proposed the reduction of the highest measure of corporal punishment from 50 lashes to 15; his proposal, however, was rejected by 233 votes to 84. A second proposal to forbid the repetition of corporal punishment within a year was rejected by 251 votes to 39; a third, finally, that compulsory labour and corporal punishment should not be applied as punishment for misdemeanours, met with the same fate, and came to grief by 291 votes against 28.

well as the without, from argument as well as force, from persuasion as well as bodily strength, seems never to have occurred to Buckle.

This entire misconception of war as a military problem would have caused us less surprise than that an historian like Buckle should have so radically misunderstood war as an historical phenomenon. Buckle has no notion of the idea which Napoleon seized with the intuition of genius, of war as a necessity arising out of the struggle for existence, the nature of mankind and the conception of the State. That a great war (*ein tüchtiger Krieg*) every fifty years, acting as a kind of moral thunderstorm, is as indispensably necessary for mankind as in the natural world are hurricanes and tempests, hail and thunder and lightning: that without war mankind soon falls into that slough of sentiment, that sluggishness of life, that foul sewer of stinking egoism—in a word, into those conditions which are the precursors of the inner dissolution of a state, or an invitation to stronger peoples to come and overthrow those which have grown feeble and faint-hearted—this view of Napoleon, true, whatever a weaker generation may say against it, does it not speak to us in the accents of all past centuries?

How can one succeed in making a people see clearly, where its most trusted leaders are struck with blindness?

But it is not merely a moral preparation for military reform on modern principles that the English nation requires; the difficulties interposed by its social structure are enormous.

The English constitution is essentially aristocratic. This fundamental principle is an obstacle in the way of equality of rights between all classes—how much more, then, in the way of equality of duties, one of which is universal liability to service!

The wealthy classes with their monstrous privileges are far too much creatures of habit to be able to rise to the notion that their duties to the state should consist in anything beyond money payments. The introduction of universal liability to service would indeed justify this all-powerful aristocracy in crying, 'This is the true beginning of our end.'

The middle-class townspeople are too much dominated by the supposed interests of industry and commerce, too much filled with the belief that universal service is prejudicial to their progress and success, to the continuance of their present life of financial prosperity, not to set their faces decidedly against it.

A middle class of country people, such as in other nations forms the great bulk of the army, and provides the best soldiers, absolutely does not exist in England.¹¹

¹¹ According to the census of 1871 there were in England and Wales, out of an entire population of 22,712,266 persons, only 22,964 who lived on their own ground and soil, and 1,657,038 engaged in agriculture. In France, on the other hand, in 1866, from an entire population of 38,147,523 persons, there were 3,226,705 independent proprietors who derived most of their subsistence from the produce of their own ground.

There remains then only the fourth, the *non-propertyed* class : it is in England certainly far the most numerous. As late as 1865 there were counted in the United Kingdom no less than 18,000,000 persons who with difficulty supported themselves, and 1,500,000 paupers requiring maintenance.

It is then this numerous and discontented class, both morally and physically the least developed of all, which must inspire itself with the idea that patriotism and the duty of service are identical ! Truly, if we consider the social structure of the English people, we can understand that no party and no ministry can venture to undertake with earnestness the great question of military reform.

The reform of the English military forces on the principle of universal liability to service corresponds so little with the aristocratic character of its institutions, with the traditions of the English people, and with the materialism of its view of life, that it is very improbable that it will be carried out before England has met with a catastrophe such as Prussia, France, and Austria have already experienced. But will the artificial edifice of the British Empire survive such a catastrophe ?

We hope it may. We hope it may, as we are fully conscious of the high function of the British Empire in the political and intellectual organism of the globe. It is a bulwark of civilisation, that precious inheritance we have received from our forefathers. It is a mighty agent, a strong and keen fighter in the great struggle between mankind and all that is hostile to it on earth.

ALEXANDER KIRCHHAMMER.

*Captain in the General Staff Imperial
Royal Austrian Army.*

WORKING MEN AND THE POLITICAL SITUATION.

WHAT do the working men of England think of the present political situation? What do they say of the Irish Land League, of coercion for Ireland, of obstruction in the House of Commons, of the way in which obstruction has been dealt with, of the general proceedings in Parliament in the first two months of the present session, and of the probable effect of these proceedings on the parliamentary institutions of the future? These questions, and others of a similar kind, have in varied phraseology been repeatedly put to me during the last few weeks.

The questions, though apparently simple, are by no means easy to answer. Those who are generally classified as working men, namely, the manual labourers of the country, very much resemble other people who think at all; they often differ widely in their opinions on the great public questions of the day. It cannot, therefore, always be truthfully said that there exists a working-class opinion as distinguished from the opinions of the rest of the community. Moreover, no man has a right, unless specially authorised to do so, to speak for a body of men so large and so diversified in character and in opinions as are the working men of England. I certainly arrogate to myself no such right. What I may fairly claim, however, is to have had a long and close connection with large bodies of working men—to have had for many years, and to have still, good opportunities of knowing their thoughts and feelings on the leading social and political topics of the time. In the following pages I shall therefore profess to give only my own individual opinions, and the result of my own observation; though in doing so I have strong reason to believe that I shall at the same time express views which extensively prevail among working men in the North of England.

I may have occasion to criticise the proceedings of Mr. Parnell and his followers, but I shall endeavour to perform that operation in no captious or offensive spirit. If I attack their policy, I shall take care neither to impugn their motives nor to asperse their character. I am personally acquainted with many of those gentlemen, and feel great respect for them. With many of their aims, if I rightly under-

stand them, I am entirely in sympathy. I have given some proof of this. An examination of the records of the House of Commons for the last few years will show that scarcely any English Member of Parliament has voted so often with them as I have done. While approving of many of their objects, however, I have felt an ever-increasing aversion to their methods. At the risk of apparent inconsistency, I have steadily voted against them whenever I considered their motions of a dilatory and an obstructive character.

Some of the ablest and shrewdest of the Home Rule leaders in the House of Commons have frequently stated to me that their great hope of achieving anything good for their country was by enlisting the sympathies and securing the assistance of the Radicals and working men of Great Britain. They believed, and rightly believed, that the great majority of the English people had no interest in the misgovernment of Ireland, and no wish to maintain the union between the two countries otherwise than in a spirit of justice to the Irish people and on terms of perfect equality. No one can doubt that of late strenuous and persistent efforts have been put forth to secure such an alliance. Nor was the time altogether inopportune. There were, indeed, many circumstances, negative and positive, very favourable to its accomplishment. The old anti-Irish feeling which operated with such force, bitterness, and intensity among English workmen and artisans some years ago had happily disappeared, and no provocation seemed capable of reviving it. The great mass of Englishmen of every class and creed had become fully sensible of the wrongs inflicted upon Ireland by centuries of misgovernment, and there was at last a genuine desire to make amends for past errors and to do justice to the people of that country. The action of the Government, too, at the beginning of the session appeared to afford favourable opportunity for agitation among the great constituencies of England. Seldom has such combustible material been prepared and placed ready for fierce declamation and passionate appeals to popular sympathies. The case was put thus: 'There was in Ireland a wretched starving peasantry, in too many instances robbed by unjust laws of the fruits of their industry. The land laws were admittedly unjust, and other grievances called loudly for redress. But instead of reform there was a drastic measure of coercion. While resisting this measure, the Irish members were silenced, and afterwards expelled from the House of Commons. New rules were specially devised to push this hateful bill with all speed through Parliament. Mr. Davitt, one of the ablest leaders of the Land League, was arrested and sent to prison without any reason being assigned for his incarceration.' The Irish Members of Parliament had all this excellent material for agitation and declamation: They had in their ranks men capable of making the best possible use of it—able, eloquent speakers, ready at any personal sacrifice to address public meetings in every part of the United Kingdom. The artisans, labourers, and trades-unionists of

the country were appealed to, and asked what they as free independent Britons thought of this unheard-of tyranny? To elicit an expression of their opinion, the potent machinery of agitation was set in motion. An Anti-Coercion League was established; public meetings were organised, large demonstrations were held in the chief centres of industry throughout the country, addressed by some of the most eloquent speakers of the Irish party. And what has been the result?

It can hardly be said that the agitation has been successful. No doubt, crowded, enthusiastic, and in some cases unanimous meetings have been held. But I think no one will pretend that the great mass of the artisans and working men of England, or any considerable number of them, have been won over to the side of the Irish Land League, have been led to endorse the policy adopted by the active section of the Home Rulers in the House of Commons, or have had their faith in the Liberal Government to any appreciable extent destroyed or weakened. The great trades-unions of the country have certainly given no response whatever to the appeal. Even in the northern counties, where one of the most powerful and widely circulated of the Liberal newspapers warmly espoused the cause of the Irish members, the result has not been at all commensurate with the efforts put forth. Why, with so many circumstances in favour of the agitation, was so little effect produced?

Though the Irish members had much in their favour, they had, on the other hand, great difficulties to encounter. A powerful Liberal Government had just succeeded to office, and though the working men disliked coercion, they had very great confidence in the Government. In the Cabinet were men who had fought long and bravely, and had won great popular victories. At the head of the administration was a veteran statesman who had a stronger hold on the heart and imagination of the people than ever statesman had before. There was almost boundless faith in the Government, and that faith was not to be shaken and overthrown in a day.

The autumn and winter campaign of the Land Leaguers in Ireland did not at all help them with English public opinion. I was in Northumberland at the time; I was daily associating with large numbers of working men, and had good means of judging of the effect produced. Their sympathies at the beginning were wholly with the Irish peasantry and tenant-farmers. But the reports of the speeches delivered at League meetings tended to weaken that sympathy, if not to extinguish it altogether. I have no means of knowing whether the newspaper reports were accurate. They were doubtless very imperfect; they might sometimes be distorted and garbled. What I know is that we were told of large and enthusiastic meetings addressed by Irish Members of Parliament. The speakers were reported to have inveighed strongly against the Liberal Government, frequently attacking by name some of its leading members. There was not a word

of frank acknowledgment that the Government had tried, however imperfectly, to deal with the question of land reform; not a whisper of censure was uttered against the House of Lords for having thrown out the Compensation for Disturbance Bill. Every available shaft of ridicule, every arrow of sarcasm, was hurled at the Government, and the Irish peasants were told that it was utterly hopeless to look to any British House of Commons or to any British party for remedy or redress.

I shall not stop to ask what effect language of this kind, addressed to an excited people smarting under a sense of injustice, was likely to produce. I am dealing with its effect on English opinion, and I know it estranged great numbers of Radicals and working men who otherwise were favourably disposed to the Irish peasantry. I met scores of working men, and Liberals of other classes, who thought that Mr. Parnell and his friends were behaving exceedingly ill to the Government. 'For six years,' they said, 'we had a compact Tory administration, which neither did anything, nor attempted to do anything for Ireland. Every measure, however fair and moderate, brought forward by the Irish members themselves, was scornfully rejected by overwhelming majorities. Mr. Parnell and his followers accepted these rebuffs with apparent equanimity. But no sooner is a Liberal Government placed in power, a Government known to be well-disposed towards Ireland and giving clear and speedy evidence of that good disposition, than a fierce and violent agitation is commenced against them, and carried on with the utmost vigour throughout Ireland.' This may not be a just presentment of the case, but I have not the slightest doubt that considerations of this kind have driven away, and perhaps made entirely hostile, great numbers of Englishmen who might have been staunch and resolute friends. If the agitation made converts to the Land League in Ireland, it certainly offended and alienated large numbers of Englishmen.

It may, indeed, be fairly asked whether, if the object aimed at was to obtain a really good Land Bill for Ireland, there was not an altogether fatal mistake committed in the field selected for the campaign. Mr. A. M. Sullivan, in a speech delivered a few days ago in the House of Commons, said he had warned his friends that they were committing a grave error in addressing meetings in Ireland and leaving English public opinion uninformed or misinformed. It seems to me that their chief, if not their exclusive, attention should have been given to England. Instead of agitating on the other side of the Irish Channel they should have been aiding the English Liberals to educate public opinion on this side. The Irish tenants could require no arguments to convince them of the necessity of land reform. All they needed was thorough union, and they should have been able, with some little help from intelligent sympathisers, to perfect their organisation.

Another mistake made in the recent agitation was in basing it too much on narrow, exclusive class grounds. The trades-unions were

appealed to, and asked to support the Irish tenant-farmers who were fighting a great battle on behalf of the cause of labour. I do not say that it was altogether improper to make a class appeal, but it was a great error to emphasise it, and to make this point the foundation of the movement. We, no doubt, have classes, and shall continue to have them, if not always, at least for a long time to come; but class feelings, class distinctions, and class prejudices are fast dying out, and the sooner they are altogether obliterated the better. Working men are much more likely to be influenced by some great chivalrous idea, which may even appear thoroughly utopian, than by an appeal to their sordid material interests. In spite of the unreasoning disinclination of many Englishmen to even so much as discuss the question of the legislative independence of Ireland, an agitation carried on openly with that object and advocated in a broad, generous, candid spirit would be much more likely to win the support of British working men than any appeal, however forcible and eloquent, to their class feelings and prejudices.

That very large section of English working men connected with trades-unions viewed with great dislike the many references by Irish members to disturbances arising out of the miners' strike in Lancashire, and to the trades-union outrages which occurred at Sheffield several years ago. Nearly every day while the strike in Lancashire was going on, the Home Secretary was asked by some Irish Member of Parliament if his attention had been called to the riots which were taking place and if he was prepared to take steps for the protection of life and property in the disturbed district. Everybody in the House of Commons knew, of course, that the questions were ironical, and were simply meant to convey the notion, too well-founded, I fear, that British ministers have one cure for riot in Ireland and another for riot in England. But at a time, when it was desirable to conciliate and win the help of English working men, it was unwise to do anything likely to offend them.

The Irish Land League has been compared to the English trades-unions. Mr. Parnell gave great offence to many trades-unionists by referring to the outrages perpetrated by the unions some years ago. I heard Mr. Parnell's speech, and though I think the reference might as well have been omitted, I did not consider his remarks were either unfair or ungenerous. His argument was that every popular class movement in its earlier stages has been accused of lawlessness and outrage by those whose interests were threatened. And he instanced the trades-unions as a case in point. His general principle was sound; the example by which he illustrated it was not, I think, happily selected. It is quite true that the trades-unions were accused; it is equally true that outrages were encouraged and committed by some of the officials of the unions. But Mr. Parnell did not state that the unions generally repudiated and denounced these outrages. That in

itself was not perhaps of much consequence ; for I believe it is a fact, that no one condemned the Sheffield malpractices more loudly than Mr. Broadhead himself, who was afterwards proved to have been one of the chief agents in their perpetration. But what is of greater importance is the fact that the Royal Commission, appointed at the request of the unions, conclusively proved that the crimes and outrages were confined to a very small section of the trade societies of two towns. The great mass of the unionists—an army some hundreds of thousands strong—were entirely free from all complicity in outrage or illegality of any kind. The subsequent conduct of these societies has been such as to place them in a position which needs no vindication..

There is undoubtedly some similarity between the trades-unions and the Irish Land League. Both alike aim to uplift a class and to enable the toiler to reap the fruit of his industry. There is, too, some identity of method in the pursuit of these objects. Boycotting, which has been such an effective weapon in the hands of the Land League, has been practised in one shape or another not only by English trades-unionists, but by men of nearly every rank and profession in society. If the practice has never before been carried out so widely and so cruelly, it has probably been from difference of circumstances and from lack of power rather than from difference of principle or dissimilarity in the character of the men concerned.

But here I think the comparison must end. The responsible and recognised leaders of trades-unions have always urged upon their members to obey the law. They have never advocated breach of contract. They have recommended adherence to contract and obedience to law even when they knew the law was unjust, and the contract of the most one-sided and iniquitous character. They have used the power of their associations to alter and amend the law and the contract ; but until that was accomplished they have felt that their honour as men and their loyalty as citizens alike imposed the strictest obedience.. The unions have, except in cases of general strikes and lock-outs, been carried on by money subscribed by their own members ; and they have almost invariably been conducted by men connected with their own respective trades. The most successful of their leaders have made it their chief business to organise the members, to guide and educate them, and to counsel self-control and moderation, rather than to inflame their passions and rouse their anger during times of excitement and social revolution.

These considerations may, to some extent, account for the coldness of the response to the appeals of the Irish Land League and for the lack of sympathy shown by the English trades-unionists with the policy followed by that association.

But the obstructive tactics pursued in Parliament have done more than anything else to alienate and drive away English Radicals, and to make it impossible that any real and hearty co-operation should

exist between them and the followers of Mr. Parnell. If the intention had been to insult and degrade the House of Commons, to entirely prevent the transaction of the business of the country, and to strike a fatal blow at the very principle of representative government, the methods followed could hardly have been better adapted to their end than they have been. It is quite true that obstruction was not invented by Mr. Parnell. Leading politicians and statesmen of both parties have practised the art—sometimes with great skill and persistence. But their efforts were fitful and occasional, and they always knew when to stop. Never before was obstruction systematised, reduced to a principle, pursued for its own sake, and carried out in a way to set the feeling of the whole House of Commons, and that of the majority of the people outside, against those who practised it.

It is not simply the attitude taken this session that is objectionable. Great allowance would have been made, and has been made, for the conduct of the Irish members in using every form of the House to delay the passing of the coercive measures of the Government. But long before the beginning of this session an evil reputation had been made by Mr. Parnell and his party, and it was easy to exhaust the small remnant of patience that was left, and to bring about a crisis. Had the Home Rulers put forward half-a-dozen of their best speakers to utter a strong and dignified protest against the Coercion Bill—that, with the able speeches of Mr. Cowen and Mr. Labouchere, would have prepared the way for a really effective appeal to the country in their favour. Instead of this, they have talked against time; they have forced needless divisions; they have adopted a policy of exasperation; they have broken the rules of the House, bid defiance to the authority of the Speaker, and so acted as to necessitate their expulsion from the House of Commons. Whatever sympathy there was with them among the working classes in their resistance to coercion—and I believe there was much—I have found none whatever with their mode of carrying out that resistance.

There is, however, 'a soul of good in things evil,' and vexatious and mischievous as obstruction is, it has forcibly illustrated the necessity of certain reforms, which are greatly needed, but which, without the action of the Irish members, might have taken a much longer period to ripen and develop. One of these reforms is the alteration of the rules of debate in the House of Commons; and the other is one of still greater importance—the lessening of the enormous and ever-increasing quantity of business thrown upon Parliament, by remitting that portion of it which is essentially local in its nature to local representative bodies.

The rules of the House of Commons, whether written or unwritten, have grown up or been framed with a view to secure one object—the full and exhaustive discussion of every topic brought before Parliament. Every member may speak on every topic, and may talk

as long as he likes. In Committee he may speak as many times as he wishes, and here, again, there is no limit to the length of time he may occupy. The possibility of too much talk, and the desirability of bringing the debate to an end, seem never to have been contemplated. In the spacious, leisurely times of the past no great practical inconvenience ensued. Business was much less in quantity and much less urgent in character than now. Fewer members took part in the debates, and those who spoke were less likely to abuse their privileges because they were more amenable to the general feeling of the House than are the Irish members at the present time. Anyone inclined to transgress unduly and to become a bore could usually be silenced by one or other of the methods for stopping irrelevant speech which the House of Commons knows so well how to practise. If he could not be put down by clamorous shouts of 'divide,' 'divide,' 'agreed,' 'agreed,' he might be silenced, or at least made inaudible, by that murmuring conversation all round, that ostentatious inattention which is so chilling to any orator who speaks only to advance his cause. If he were proof alike against hostility and indifference he could be left to waste his strength, if not his sweetness and light, on the deserted benches around him. With the almost universal feeling of the House of Commons against him, with no public sentiment outside to sustain and cheer him, he must either have been a very obstinate man or have had great confidence in the justice of his cause if he could for long have maintained this attitude of hostility. But given a compact and resolute body of members, some of whom can speak really well when they have anything to say, many of whom can talk at great length without saying anything in particular, all of whom can speak either to a hostile or an inattentive audience, or without any audience whatever—a body who do not lose but who actually gain popularity with their constituents the more they annoy, irritate, and insult the feelings of the House of Commons—the problem, under these circumstances, becomes a very different one. It is a problem so difficult, indeed, as to necessitate some radical change, if the public business of the country has not to be brought entirely to a standstill.

As it is, the House of Commons is struck with paralysis. Nothing can be done except under pressure of 'urgency.' The rules of 'urgency' cannot be voted without the help of the Conservatives, and they will never help except to pass measures of the character of the Coercion Bill. Parliament can coerce, but it is impotent to remedy. The rules of urgency are of doubtful value, since they can, from their very nature, be applied only intermittently. As soon as ordinary business is resumed, the flood-gates are thrown open, and the torrent of irrelevant and unprofitable talk rushes forth with all the more force from having been temporarily checked and dammed back. The fixing of a certain hour for ending a debate is not a satisfactory

way of dealing with the difficulty. Let us suppose that a bill is in Committee. Its discussion has occupied an unconscionable time. Palpable and ostentatious obstruction has been practised. Then it is resolved that at twelve o'clock that night every amendment on the notice paper shall be put forthwith. The whole interval may be utterly wasted and trifled away; but when the hour is reached, every amendment, however important, must be voted upon and decided in hot haste, without debate or explanation. This, to put it mildly, is not a rational mode of proceeding. And yet what else can be done? It is proverbially easy to criticise; it is difficult to suggest a better method. I am aware, too, that any judgment of mine upon a point of this kind will carry little weight. One or two things, negative and positive, are, however, clear to me. The remedy for obstruction, whatever it may be, is not to vote urgency. The aim should be to lay hold of the individual offender, and to treat him with firmness, if not with severity. Suspension for a single sitting is little better than a farce, unless you are dealing with a man of a highly sensitive nature, and the practised obstructionist is not always a man of that type.

The notion that the *clôture* in one shape or another will have to be adopted by the British House of Commons is gaining ground very fast. At first its foreign name made against it in the minds of working men. But this insular prejudice soon disappeared when the thing signified was understood, and was thought to be necessary and advantageous. On the face of it, it seems reasonable that the House of Commons, like nearly every other legislative assembly in the world, should have the power to bring a debate to an end, even though every member of the six hundred and fifty may not have talked until he has exhausted his strength, and long after he has exhausted the patience of his hearers.

The working classes of England feel great pride in the House of Commons, with its grand history and its noble traditions. Though not well versed in historical lore, they know something of the struggles by which its powers and liberties have been achieved. They owe something to it, and they expect much from it. They have almost boundless faith in peaceful and constitutional agitation. They have learned by experience that in this country free discussion ripens public opinion, and that every demand founded on justice ultimately becomes law. Those, therefore, who act so as to discredit and weaken the authority of Parliament can never expect to win the confidence and approval of the working people. But though our labouring population respect and revere the House of Commons, their reverence does not degenerate into superstition. They do not make a fetish of its forms. They like fine speeches; but, after all, they consider that the paramount duty of the House is to do the work of the country, and that oratory, however brilliant and however beautiful, is valuable only so far as it conduces to wise and beneficent legislation.

I have criticised freely—I hope not unfairly—the obstructive methods followed by a section of the Irish members. I think that their conduct is most mischievous, and that it contravenes the first principles of representative government. I have, therefore, the strongest possible aversion to it. But in fairness we must remember that these men represent Ireland and Irish opinion, and not England and English opinion. They are supported and applauded by their constituents. The real and sad significance of it all is that they are engaged in rebellion against British rule. They know they cannot face the power of Britain on the battle-field, so they carry the spirit of rebellion into the High Court of Parliament. ‘They are,’ as the writer known as ‘Verax’ has well said, ‘a party of belligerents, who have managed to get inside the citadel, and are resolved to blow it up if they cannot force the garrison to surrender.’ They hope, perhaps, by clogging the wheels of the legislative machine, to compel Parliament to buy them off by surrendering to the cry for national independence. In this they are doubtless entirely mistaken. They may prevent useful and much-needed legislation for England. They may deprive Englishmen of dearly cherished rights and liberties; but they will never wrest from a British Parliament by menace what they cannot win from it by reason and fair argument.

Still, let us never forget that there are grave and terrible grievances in Ireland. Whole districts of that unfortunate country have really been passing through a great social revolution. The dire wretchedness of the people has driven them to desperation and to the verge of civil war. The motive power of the upheaval has been agrarian. But behind the land question there is a political problem. Mr. Parnell has more than once declared that he cares for land reform only so far as it will help forward the independence of Ireland. Whatever Parliament can do to place land tenure on a just and satisfactory basis we may hope will before long be done. But there still remains the political difficulty to be grappled with. That ought to be boldly faced, and freely and fearlessly discussed. The patriotic feeling that burns in the hearts of tens of thousands of the best and bravest of Irishmen is a grand and noble sentiment, and we should at least show that we respect that sentiment, even if we cannot give it complete satisfaction.

I do not venture to say what shape our recognition of the claims of Irishmen to some measure of self-government should assume. It need not necessarily be the system known as Home Rule. I must confess that, though I have always myself voted for Home Rule, my confidence in it has not of late been increasing. Of one thing I am quite sure, instead of having made headway among the working classes of the north of England, it is much less popular with them than it was some years ago. This is due, not to any diminished sympathy with Ireland, or to a less ardent desire to do justice to that country,

but chiefly, I think, to the fact that the system is imperfectly understood, never yet having been thoroughly shaped and formulated by its advocates.

Irishmen are often exhorted to look at Scotland, where they will see a people who have ceased to make wars of insurrection, who have cordially participated in English rule, and who have become an integral part of the British Empire. They are told to follow that excellent example. The example is most instructive, though it does not perhaps convey the lesson which the critics of Irish policy wish to inculcate. Never was the spirit of nationality stronger than in Scotland; never did the pure flame of patriotism burn more brightly than in the hearts of the people of that country. They loved their independence, and fought for it with a determination and a courage which were unconquerable. Scotland was for centuries just as hostile and irreconcilable as Ireland is to-day. Now all this is happily changed. There is real and complete union, perfect harmony of spirit and feeling, between the northern and the southern portions of the island. What has produced this happy change? Several causes may have co-operated. But it is certain that Englishmen quite as much as Irishmen have lessons to learn from Scottish history. So long as we attempted to rule Scotland by sheer force without regard to the feelings of the people, there was rebellion, open or concealed. For many years now Scotland has had a large share of self-government. Her own special laws and usages have been respected and recognised. The administration of Scottish affairs has been placed largely, if not altogether, in the hands of Scotchmen. But suppose we sent an Englishman as Lord Lieutenant to govern Scotland, appointed an Englishman as Lord Advocate, and English barristers as judges to administer justice in Scotland, and, abolishing every Scottish law and usage, enforced our systems and methods upon the inhabitants of that country; suppose we rejected, not once or twice, but systematically and without variation, every bill brought in by a Scotch Member of Parliament and supported by nearly all the representatives of that country in the House of Commons; suppose we flouted and opposed the national sentiment and ran counter, not only to the prejudices, but to the clearly expressed and reasonable wishes, of the Scotch people in every particular and on every occasion. Does any one believe that Scotchmen would for long tamely and quietly submit and remain loyal, contented, and attached subjects of the Crown? A policy similar to this, however, is what we have been pursuing, and to some extent are still pursuing with regard to Ireland. That policy must be reversed.

The outlook at present is not hopeful, but we have advanced thus far, that the great majority of Englishmen are sincerely anxious to do justice to Ireland. They want to govern Ireland, as far as can be done, according to Irish ideas. This is much; but it is not exactly the

right thing, and it is not enough. As Mr. Boyd Kinnear, in a very able and suggestive pamphlet on Ireland, has said: 'The truth which we ought to grasp is that it is our duty not to govern Ireland at all, but to let Irishmen govern themselves. And if ever we must interfere, it ought not to be to indulge "Irish ideas," but rather when it may be necessary, to oppose Irish ideas, if at any time party spirit, prejudice, or misconception, should lead Irishmen to adopt a course at variance with principles of justice.'

English statesmen must endeavour to take in hand and substantially settle this Irish question. And it is surely not too much to ask Irishmen of influence not to increase the hardness of a task that is already bristling with difficulties. Chronic disquiet and dissatisfaction cannot go on for ever. Amid much that is doubtful and confusing, one thing is to my mind clear and certain. The time is fast coming, if it has not already arrived, when public opinion in this country will not allow Ireland to be ruled contrary to the deliberately expressed sense of justice of the great bulk of its people. If the Union between this country and Ireland must be maintained, we shall have to give, as we perhaps can give, stronger and better reasons for it than the supposed necessities, the fears or the interests of England.

THOMAS BURT.

PERSIA AND ITS PASSION-DRAMA.¹

The eminence, the nobleness of a people depends on its capability of being stirred by memories, and striving for what we call spiritual ends, ends which consist not in immediate material possession, but in the satisfaction of a great feeling that animates the collective body as with one soul. (GEORGE ELIOT, *Impressions of Theophrastus Such.*)

OF the great dramatic literatures of the world—the Indian, the Greek, and the modern European—we may say that the two last were essentially popular in origin, while the first did not display unmistakable popular characteristics till somewhat late in its history. The requisites for a national drama are (setting aside the individual genius of authorship) a national history, a national progression or expansion, and a refining influence: a national history supplies material with which the audience is familiar; a national expansion creates a unanimity and interest which bestow encouragement on those connected with the representation; a refining influence—the result, of course, of many and varied circumstances—endows the literature with an ennobling and lasting truth.

The first beginnings of the Indian and the Greek theatre are shrouded in obscurity. The modern European drama owes so much to the influence of the Renaissance that, though probably in no country did a truly national drama come into being, unless the elements of dramatic, and original dramatic, representation had previously existed in that country, yet it was the revival of ancient letters that gave to the modern drama its form, its literary value, and its popularity. Such being the case, an inquiry into the originating causes of the theatre of to-day in a great measure resolves itself into a due appreciation of the influence first exercised upon its rude beginnings by the Renaissance, and to what extent each branch of it ultimately emancipated itself. Such a simplification may be said to deprive in some degree the inquiry of its interest.

It is with eagerness, then, that students of such matters should turn to Persia, where there exists at the present time a Passion-drama on a scale hitherto unknown, and which seems to give promise of a

¹ I express my grateful acknowledgments to Monsieur Chodzko and Mr. Wollaston for their supervision of the proofs of this article.

standard drama which may fulfil the conditions of the best national literature. To what extent it does so now I purpose to investigate. Before proceeding, however, I would disclaim all hope and desire of casting any new light on subjects which have already been sifted by Orientalists, or of in any way appearing in competition with those to whom any pretension of mine to Eastern learning must seem arrogant and unwarrantable. The Persian Play has been treated of, in its contemporaneous aspects, by M. Chodzko, the Comte de Gobineau, and Sir Lewis Pelly (each of whose works contain selections from the plays themselves), and Professor Dozy, in an essay which also deals with the whole history of Mahomedanism.² I may claim, however, to have pushed my inquiries somewhat further than these authors, with a view to ascertaining, from works of travel and history, how far the existing phenomena can be accounted for by pre-existing and co-existing circumstances.

In respect to its Passion-drama, Persia stands alone amongst Mahomedan nations. The Sheeah doctrine has been called 'a protest of Aryan thought against Semitic ideas'—a protest which has gradually created for itself a dramatic form. 'There is no instance of a drama, properly so-called, in any Semitic language.' The contrast between Aryan and Semitic civilisation is of the utmost importance in the appreciation of Mahomedan history. In it lies the key to the long-succession of Mahomedan dissensions, had it not been for which, Charles Martel might have succumbed on the plain of Tours, and Eastern Europe, too, have failed to stem the tide of infidel invasion. The Semitic mind is not in the highest sense imaginative. This higher imagination contracting, as it does, a belief in immortality is at the bottom of all drama. The Semitic peoples had no such belief; it was unknown to the early Arabians, to whom it at length found its way through Persia and colonists from the East.

Sheeism may be said to be, in one of its aspects, a want of appreciation of the individuality of Mahomed, resulting from the anti-Aryan restriction of thought which such a belief imposed.

The domination of Mahomed was the principal cause of the rapid propagation of Mahomedanism, and entailed the simplicity which rendered that religion easy of adoption: but in this, its essence, lies the secret of its non-pliedability. It is a religious despotism: a monarch elected by acclamation is often the most despotic of kings. Thus it will be readily understood that while Persia resented the freedom of institutions introduced by their nomad invaders, they were none the less opposed to the exclusive tyranny of the Caliphs. After the domination of the Greeks and Parthians, the Sassanid dynasty came to the Persian throne as part and parcel of the national life and re-

² I may also mention Mr. Vereschagin's work on the Caucasus, which though written in an unfamiliar language, contains illustrations of the Persian Play by his excellent pencil.

viving the national religion. The circumstances themselves, however, of the Sassanid restoration defeated the hopes of its supporters. The constitution had lost its popular character and the monarchy had ceased to be elective. The idea introduced by Buddhist missionaries from India of 'the divine right of kings' had been incorporated in the national creed; and thus it was that, despite the retention of many of the liberal characteristics of ancient times, reverence for kingship militated against the domination of Mahomed. The antagonism between Sunnee and Sheea is not so much religious as political and national. In point of fact it resides in a difference of belief as to the transmission of the supreme power.

On the death of Mahomed Abou-bakr, his uncle was declared his successor to the exclusion of the inhabitants of Medina, who had claimed the office as a reward for the priority of their belief in the Prophet. This election was probably intended by Mahomed, and was politic inasmuch as it invested Mecca with the hegemony of Arabia. Omar and Othman succeeded Abou-bakr, and after them Alee, the son-in-law of Mahomed; the latter was assassinated shortly after his accession, and the Caliphate no longer continued in his family. The Sheeas, however, refuse to recognise Abou-bakr, Omar, and Othman as Caliphs; and declare that Alee was Mahomed's only lawful successor, and after him his two sons Hasan and Husain. This is the main subject of difference between Sunnee and Sheea. The dispute is as old as Alee himself, who was not only called the first Caliph by his contemporaries, but was said to inherit the divinity of Mahomed. His death, too, originated the doctrine of the 'concealed Imam' which has been since transferred to the twelfth Imam, Mahdee. The Persians of the present day believe that the government is held for Mahdee by his lieutenants, and that he will return one day to claim his kingdom. The establishment of Sheeism as the prevailing religion may be ascribed to the ninth century, and in the succeeding century Ahmad Muizz-ed-Daulat founded the Muharram celebration; but during the repeated dynastic changes and invasions to which Persia was subsequently subjected, the attachment to the national religion became weakened, so that it was not till the accession of the Sufawee kings at the end of the fifteenth century that Sheeism reasserted itself and was constituted the national religion of *modern* Persia. The victory won on the plains of Kadisia was of vital importance to Mahomedanism; for, though the sons of the desert were corrupted by the luxury of the conquered people, yet the Persians became proselytisers of the new religion, and coloured it with their national beliefs. By her superior civilisation, the cause of her downfall, Persia was enabled to reassert her own identity. In the ages directly succeeding Mahomed, Sheeism spread itself far and wide. East and West the Moslem colonies succumbed to it. It invaded the holy places themselves, so that

the true descendants of the Prophet, from "the isolated table-lands of Spain, whither they had been driven by internal dissensions, beheld heresy committing sacrilege in their shrines, and exclaimed with indignant amazement: 'In our country not a shadow of heresy is tolerated; churches and synagogues have vanished from the land.' It seemed indeed as if the Prophet looked down from Paradise, under which it was fabled that the Alhambra stood, and guided his people in the way of the true faith. But in Persia alone did Sheeism become the national religion, and its establishment as such gave to a country 'in which patriotism was unknown, a principle of union, of equal, if not greater, force.' The misfortunes of Alee, Fatima, and the holy Imams, typify the melancholy past and the dreary present of the Persian nation. It is on these scenes of calamity that the Passion-play dwells, awakening an answering echo in the breast of the spectator. Perhaps there is no better instrument for arousing the public spirit of a country than the discovery of a parallel to the wrongs of the present in the annals of the past.

The annual theatrical performances of the Muharram constitute a most sacred ceremony; the whole of Persia unites to commemorate the history of 'the family of the Tent,' as the Shee martyrs are called. Every one strives to render assistance. Mothers send their sons to distribute provisions amongst the crowd; rich men lend their costly rugs and garments for purposes of decoration. The atheist, the infidel, and the alien are all equally requisitioned, for the cause is national. There is a *takyah*, or theatre, in every town (excepting in parts of the country where the drama is not known); in each quarter of every city, there are takyahs belonging to guilds, to nobles, to merchants, to the king himself. To give a takyah, or representation, is to do a meritorious act. The description of the takyah of the Shah is a curious one. It stands in the principal of those wide and dusty spaces, broken only by low mud walls, and filled with irregular mounds and deep, break-neck ruts, which in Tehran, as in other Persian cities, represent the squares of Western towns. The appearance of the façade is characteristically described by Mr. Arthur Arnold.

The front of this building is a good specimen of modern Persian architecture, which in England we should recognise as the Rosherville or Cremorne style, the gewgaw, pretentious, vulgar, and ephemeral style, erected in those places of amusement only to be seen at night and to last for a season. The façade is shaped like a small transept of the Crystal Palace and covered with florid coarse decorations in plaster, with beadings of bits of coarse looking-glass, bright blue, red, yellow, and green being plentifully laid upon the plaster wherever there is opportunity.

How strange a contrast to the solemn scenes that are enacted within! yet how typical of the want of discrimination of Persian taste! ³

* In the tekyehs belonging to the town wards, some convenient square is chosen so that the upper classes look down from their windows and galleries on the performance while the crowd squats below. A parallel to the beginning of our own theatre is here suggested.

The interior is one vast parallelogram or circle, in some theatres containing only one or two thousand spectators, in others as many as twenty thousand. In the midst of this stands the *sakoo*, or stage, about five feet above the level of the floor and accessible by steps at either end. Around it are erected black posts, bearing poles of the same sombre colour, whose office it is to sustain the coloured lanterns and lamps to give light during the interludes of music and preaching that continue throughout the night. Over the audience is stretched a *velamen*, or awning, to protect them from the summer heat or the winter blast, for the time of the Muharram celebration varies from year to year. Opposite to the *sakoo*, or stage, is a 'loge,' or box, called the 'tajnuma,' raised about fifteen feet from the ground, the residence of stage-royalty. There, surrounded by the most costly stuffs, the rarest china, the most brilliant glass-ware, Yazeed the traitor, the murderer of Husain, holds his court. Round the walls of the *takyah* are the boxes of the nobility, which, in like manner, glisten with barbaric splendour. These are free to the first comer, if not occupied before the representation begins. On the folds of the costly shawl, wrought in the highlands of Kashmere, leans the unwashed brow of the mendicant; in the silver goblet, at other seasons reserved for princely lips, he plunges his greasy mouth and uncleansed moustachios. Prince and peasant, Ghebre and Barbar, Jew and Christian, jostle together in indiscriminate confusion.⁴ Only the Sunnee is absent. 'Hasan and Husain' is all their thought; 'Hasan and Husain!' they wail forth in inharmonious concord. One is reminded of those times, long before Sunnee or Sheea existed, when, once a year, king, courtiers, and people used to dine together in one splendid banquet.

In and out of the motley multitude that crowd the arena, wander beautiful Persian boys, sons of wealthy parents, who have made a vow of their children's services on this occasion. They are a picturesque sight, with their jewelled turbans and flowing ringlets, as they distribute water in memory of the martyrs. Venerable old men, wealthy merchants, learned mirzas sprinkle rose-water in the name of Hasan and Husain. Even the noblemen's servants, reckoned in Persia, as in most countries, the proudest of all classes, do not disdain to circulate refreshments amongst the dregs of the populace. Mixed with the throng are also the vendors of pipes and pastilles scented with musk, made of dust from the holy desert of Karbalâ, the scene of the Imam's sufferings; on these the Sheea rests his forehead and prays. There are sellers, too, of cakes and lozenges of millet which is supposed to induce tears.

The play begins at 5 A.M. and consists of the representation of a single scene of which each *impresario* possesses a varied collection. Throughout the night large processions bearing banners draped in black

⁴ From recent accounts it appears that the freedom of entrance is being restricted by the priests, brought about *ostensibly* by the misconduct of European *attachés*.

—for the whole nation mourns during the Muharram—troop from tekyeh to tekyeh, headed by the Said Roozé Khans, or friars, chaunting wild refrains and crying ‘Ay Hasan! Ay Husain!’ while in the tekyehs the friars preach simple, moving discourses, touching on the sufferings of the martyrs, till the throng shouts again and again ‘Ay Hasan! Ay Husain!’ Particular days in the festival are illustrated by characteristic processions.⁵

As they sit waiting for the commencement of the play they present a strange medley of haggard faces which tell of that power of sleeplessness so incomprehensible to Europeans. They are silent till some one rises and starts a refrain of ‘Ay Hasan! Ay Husain!’ which the audience take up and continue with increasing vehemence, beating with the hollowed palm on the naked shoulder, for during the Muharram the men of the lower classes throw off all clothing from the right side of the breast. At length, however, the leader falls back exhausted, and the wild sound ceases. Now enters a band of Barbars, Moslem Africans by descent, whose ancestor, it is said, derided Mahomed. They dance the fanatical measure of the Dervish, pricking themselves with needles; the sight of blood inflames the audience, and as Barbar after Barbar sinks dizzy to the ground, their excitement becomes intense. At last the dusky leader gives the signal to cease, and the wearied dancers lift their hands to heaven crying ‘Ya Allah!’ Some such part as this did the Jews play in the carnivals of the Middle Ages. A sermon now follows from one of the Seid Rouzé Khans, and continues till the *kernas*, or trumpets, announce the arrival of the players, and the actual play begins.

Of the three translations of the Persian drama which exist—*i.e.* those by M. de Gobineau, M. Chodzko, and that produced under Sir Lewis Pelly’s superintendence—the latter is the only one which professes to give the whole narrative of the tragedy, and, together with Mr. Wollaston’s excellent explanatory notes, constitutes a very interesting and complete account of the Passion-play. It is this work that I shall follow in my outline.

The performance begins with a prologue, in which, inasmuch as it may refer only indirectly to Sheeism and be chiefly concerned with secular history, M. de Gobineau recognises the possible beginning of a standard secular drama. The conversion to Sheea belief of the conqueror Timur is a favourite subject for the prologue; but in Sir Lewis Pelly’s collection the theme chosen is ‘Joseph and his Brethren.’ The disappearance of Joseph, the treason of his brothers, the woe of Jacob, are all prototypes of the martyrdom of the Imams. Gabriel

⁵ During the Muharram the entire *répertoire* is performed, but not necessarily in chronological sequence; only on the 10th, which day is consecrated to the death of Husain, it is the custom for all the companies of actors who happen to be performing in a certain town to combine and play that stirring scene on an open space outside the walls. Also the 7th is generally devoted to the marriage of Kasim.

appears to Jacob in his grief: 'God sendeth thee salutation, saying, "What thinkest thou, O stricken man? Is thy Joseph more precious than the dear grandson of Mahomed?"' Jacob sees his error, and replies, asking to be shown the desert of Karbalâ. 'A thousand Josephs be the dust of Husain's feet. The curse of God rest on Yazeed for his foul murder!' The answer of the archangel terminates the scene. 'Alas! the tyranny of the cruel spheres! who can hear the sorrows of Karbalâ! Injustice and oppression, hatred and enmity, on that plain of trial shall be consummated in the children of God's Prophet. Nought shall be heard from that family but the cry for bread and water. Their sad voices shall reach the very throne of the Majesty on high. Their tears shall soak the field of battle. The children of that holy King of kings shall feed on their own tears alone.' The desire of Jacob to see Karbalâ is therefore the dramatic *raison d'être* of the Tazyah.

The first scene as given by M. Chodzko differs in motive from that of Sir Lewis Pelly's version. In the former, the voluntary sacrifice by Mahomed and Alee of Hasan and Husain for the *redemption* of the Sheeas is more emphatically put forward. The latter, however, appears to possess the greatest literary merit, and is, perhaps, the most natural scene in the collection. Gabriel exacts from Mahomed the sacrifice either of his own son Ibrahim or of his grandson Husain, since God has judged that there should 'not be two loves in one heart, for no end is gained thereby.' Mahomed yields up his own and only son in pity for his daughter Fatima, and in return for this act of generosity Gabriel promises that God shall have mercy on Mahomed's people in the Day of Judgment for Husain's sake, if Mahomed will grant his grandson in propitiation for their sins. The Prophet consents to this second sacrifice, and with Israeel the Angel of Death goes to fetch Ibrahim from his school. They find him reading the Koran, and at the sight of the beauty of his child the father is smitten with sorrow. Ibrahim starts with terror at the appearance of Israeel, but his father endeavours to calm his fears by a speech that exhibits something akin to the irony of Greek tragedy. 'Fear not this venerable man; he is the companion of thy way, my child. He will accompany thee on this thy journey.' They return to Mahomed's house; the child is smitten with fever, and a touching scene between Ibrahim and his sister ensues, while the awful Israeel stands over them. 'Dost thou fear death?' Fatima asks. 'I fear rather the Angel of Death,' her brother replies with natural simplicity. His sufferings are at length terminated by smelling an apple which Israeel gives him, and he dies with the Mahomedan confession of faith on his lips. 'I therefore bare witness that there is no other God but God.'

Other scenes follow which have for their motives the simplicity and generosity of Mahomed, the chivalry of Alee, his right to succeed to the office of the Prophet, and the power and importance of Husain.

The historical events thus delineated are the death of Mahomed, the seizure of the Caliphate by Abou-bakr, the assassination of Ali in the mosque at Kufa; and the martyrdom of Hasan, poisoned, it is said, by his wife at the instigation of the Syrian governor Muawiyah. Then the tragedy of Husain, for which all the preceding scenes are merely preparatory, commences, and step by step, scene by scene, the sad story is told. The end is foreshadowed by the martyrdom of Muslim and his sons, whose helpless wanderings are most pathetically described. The inhabitants of Kufa had invited Husain to come amongst them, saying that they would support his claim to the Caliphate; but Husain is advised to test the sincerity of their offers by sending Muslim before him as his herald, with the result that Muslim and his sons are added to the list of Sheea victims. At length Husain, who has persistently refused to take the oath of allegiance to Yazeed, feels his insecurity at Mecca, and is induced to try his fortune at Kufa; but it is with a sense of approaching doom that he comes to this determination.

‘Troops of gloom have suddenly invaded the heart, capital of the soul of man; they have plundered all her property—patience, resolution, and fortitude; they have laid waste her fortifications. Fate has become the guide to the commander of the caravan of faith, and Doom ever and anon cries out: “Bind up your litters and start!” We must one day set out, O my soul, from this transitory abode, and travel onwards to our eternal home.’ He leaves Mecca on the first day of the Muharram. The next scene relates how Husain and his followers are compelled, even in sight of Kufa, to turn aside from the road by the approach of an army sent against them by Yazeed. For a moment Husain becomes impatient and wrestles with his destiny. ‘Ye crooked conducted spheres, how long will ye tyrannise over us? how long will ye act thus cruelly to the family of God’s prophet?’ But it is love for his sister that produces this momentary revolt. In vain he turns to go back to Medina; his fate has already encompassed him. His horse becomes dull and spiritless. ‘Art thou,’ he exclaims, ‘art thou exhausted by the burden of trust? Dost thou know, winged horse, what awaits us in Karbalâ?’ He exchanges his horse for another; but this, too, has lost its courage. ‘Tell me, good man, what plain is this?’ he asks the camel-driver. ‘Karbalâ,’ the man answers. ‘Then,’ says the Imam, ‘my lot therein will be affliction and trial.’ He gives the order to halt, and his followers pitch the camp on the fatal plain. The Sheeas are now decimated by the losses they sustain in single combat, and earn the crown of martyrdom by disdaining to be seduced into treachery by the offers of their enemies.⁶ The patient Husain again begins to repine and

* Dr. Brugsch mentions a pretty custom now existent in Persia, and evidently a relic of the old Sheea brotherhood. At this season of the year two Persians go before the ‘Moola’ and swear a lifelong brotherhood with each other.

to rail against the spheres, as he sees his faithful comrades fall, and them whom he most loves tortured by the pangs of thirst; soon, however, he recovers himself, and after calmly prophesying his death on the morrow, exclaims: 'It is not a thing to be grieved at, that I and all my companions should be slain, since it works for the salvation of the people of my father's father, the Prophet.' Yet when he witnesses the death of his eldest son, Alee Akbar, he breaks for the first time into an uncontrollable passion of grief. Misfortune follows on misfortune, death on death, while the horrors of thirst intensify their sufferings. A strange and characteristic incident is the marriage of Husain's son, Kasim, to the daughter of Hasan, in fulfilment of an agreement previously made between the two brothers. It is a favourite with both audience and actors—with the actors because they receive for their own the wedding gifts presented by the wealthier among the spectators; with the audience because of the moving and ghastly contrast of the forms of joy in the midst of the realities of woe; the marriage bed of Kasim lies by the side of the bier of Alee Akbar. The nuptials are celebrated, and the bridegroom sallies out to death amongst the foe; once he returns crowned with victory; a draught of water would make him strong again, but no water is to be had, and he goes forth to meet his fate. (M. de Gobineau's version of this scene is considerably fuller than that of Sir Lewis Pelly.)

At this point of the drama, Husain's temptations are presented in a physical form; he is miraculously transported to India in order to save a Sheea Rajah from the jaws of a lion, which noble beast offers to help him against his enemies. Similar offers are made by the angels and the *djinn*s; but nothing can prevail upon Husain to abandon his trust, for he has resolved on martyrdom and the redemption of the world.

The Imam now takes leave of his relations, plunges into the fight, and returns wounded to his camp to die. His mother appears, in company with the Prophet, to comfort him, while his enemy Shimar watches his dying struggles, brandishing a dagger at the throat of his victim. Husain, after a few loving expressions to his relations, expires, with the words, 'Forgive, O merciful Lord, the sins of my grandfather's people, and grant me bountifully the key of the treasure of intercession.' Thus ends the tragedy of Husain.

The fortunes of his survivors are now followed out, and the connection of Persia with early Sheeism, through Husain's Persian wife Shahrbanu, is especially insisted on. The influence of the Shee doctrine on other nations is exemplified by the conversion of a Christian ambassador at the sight of Husain's head, of a Christian lady to whom Mahomed appears in a dream on the plains of Karbalā, and of a Christian king, who, having punished a party of Sheeas for their celebration of the Muharram, is brought to a sense of the truth

by being made to experience prematurely the torments of hell. Nor must we omit to mention a scene which appears to be represented on some occasions with the most ruthless realism, so that the feelings of the audience are excited to such a pitch that they fall on the chief actor in it, and make him pay a heavy penalty for his histrionic power. A camel-driver comes on the stage where has been set up the tomb of Husain, which he breaks into and rifles, defiling the body of the martyr with the most insulting expressions and actions. The concluding scene represents the Resurrection. At the third blast of the trumpet of Sarafeel, Jacob, Joseph, David, Solomon, Mahomed, Alee, Hasan, and all the Sheeas, except Husain, assemble to watch the sinners being borne away to punishment. Mahomed tries to save his followers; Alee and Hasan help him, but their joint efforts are of no avail, and the Prophet, angered by the slight thus put upon him, casts away his turban, his rod, and his cloak. At length Gabriel explains to Mahomed that Husain must assist him to obtain pardon for his followers, and that he must yield the key of intercession to him who has suffered most. Husain now appears, and an altercation arises between him and Jacob as to the relative magnitude of their sufferings; this dispute is settled by a message from God in favour of Husain, and the Prophet thus charges him: 'Go thou, and deliver from the flames every one who has in his lifetime shed a single tear for thee, every one who has in any way helped thee, every one who has performed a pilgrimage to thy shrine, or mourned for thee, and every one who has written tragic verses for thee. Bear each and all with thee to Paradise.' 'God be praised!' chant the sinners as they enter Paradise, 'by Husain's grace we are made happy, and by his favour we are delivered from destruction.

Such is the Persian Passion-play. Mr. Matthew Arnold was struck with the peculiarly Christian character of the virtues displayed by the Imams; and, throughout, the reader is not only astonished by the likeness of the principal doctrines to those of Christianity, but he is constantly reminded of the New Testament even in the most subsidiary circumstances. There is, however, one great radical difference between the Persian play and all the other mystery-plays of the Middle Ages: the Persian play is 'the noise of the mourning of a mighty nation.'

Before I am at liberty to treat my subject in the manner I propose, I must record my reasons and my proofs for considering the Persian drama as an outgrowth of modern times. Previous and subsequent to the Greek conquest Persia was thoroughly conversant with the Attic drama. Greek was the language of political and commercial intercourse throughout that part of Asia. Mr. Morier speaks of having discovered the ruins of a Greek theatre in the centre of the country; but when Greek civilisation was minimised by the Parthian domina-

tion, Greek drama was blotted out from the literature of Iran, and does not appear to have recovered its popularity, though subsequently Greek philosophy became the favourite study of the courts. Whether there still remain traces of it in the tragic dance of the Bakhtyaree, or in certain details of the drama itself, is merely food for speculation. The origin of the present drama is involved in obscurity. I have in vain applied to orientalists for information; but neither I nor they, who have access to documents, alas! inaccessible to me, can find any authoritative statement on this point. It may have commenced under the national dynasty of the Sufawees in the sixteenth or seventeenth century, as some have thought, or it may not have arisen till considerably nearer our own time. It may have been introduced from India, where, as at Beejapore, the Portuguese established an imitation of the European mystery-play, or it may have been imported direct into Persia from the Portuguese settlement at Ormuz. The mere question of origin and date of introduction, however, matters little to us. There is sufficient proof, I think, that the drama, as it now exists, was not popularised in Persia before the end of the last and the beginning of the present century, though, since any test that I can apply is by elimination, it is of necessity subject to correction. M. de Gobineau writes of having spoken with Persians who remembered when the tazyah was acted with one or two actors alone, which, arguing from Greek analogy, would point not only to the date of the commencement of the drama, but also to the fact that it was never introduced, and arose, like the Greek drama, out of the country itself. The first mention that I can discover of its existence is by Francklin, who travelled during the years 1786-87, and would seem to imply a somewhat earlier origin than M. de Gobineau assigns to it. It is a slight description, and merely recounts how the Said recites the story of Husain out of the '*wakaâ*,' which is 'written with all the pathetic elegance the Persian language is capable of expressing,' and how 'each day some particular action of the story is represented by people selected for the purpose of personating those concerned in it.' He also notes the marriage of Kasim, as being the favourite scene, and adds, 'The frenzy which exists during the processions is such as I never saw exceeded by any people.' A still more important point is the absence of any allusion to dramatic representation by those authors who devote considerable space to the Muharram. Such being the case, there is no assumption in stating that the popular influence of the Persian drama dates from quite recent times.

At the beginning of this paper I proclaimed my purpose of investigating how far the Persian drama contained the requisites of a great national dramatic literature, and the first of these I stated was a national history, as supplying material familiar to the audience.

The reader will have already perceived that the history of Sheeism

is the history of Persia. From the time of the Abbassides to the present dynasty usurpers have constantly played upon the religious feeling of the people in order to compass their own ends. It has been remarked how great a stimulus is given to Sheeism by the fact that the tombs of the Imams are on Turkish ground. The founders of the last two dynasties and the infidel Nadir, though he afterwards dreaded the feelings he had aroused and prohibited the practice of Sheeism under pain of mutilation and death, did not fail to strengthen themselves by appealing to the religious patriotism of their subjects and pointing to those holy relics across the frontier. Sheeism has preserved the continuity of the nation; and throughout the many dynastic changes which Persia has undergone, its steadfast light has never ceased to burn, and when threatened with extinction, has only exhibited a brighter flame.

Nothing proves more completely that the present of Persia is centred in the past than a glance at the existing state of her literature. The legendary past contained the entire history of Persia's greatness when her famous poets Firdusee, Sadee, Hafiz, and others wrote, and they appear to have handled these legends in such a manner as to stamp them on the memories of their countrymen in verses which have become proverbial, and thus to preclude the popularity of any other rehabilitation of the same themes. Such also seems to have been the case with Homer. Rustam and Sohrab and the snow-haired Zal, Ardasheer, Shapoor, Noosheerwan, still remain the Persian ideals of greatness, of moral excellence, of nobility, of chivalrous valour; and the most natural way for one Persian to express his admiration for another is to institute some comparison between him and those heroes of old. The famous apron of Kaf had often led the Iranese to victory and conquest ere that banner bowed its head before the green standard of Islam. Thus the Persian of to-day looks back through the vistas of history on the past pre-eminence of his country, and sighs for those glorious times till the remote figures of antiquity become 'larger than human' in the mist of legend that gathers round them, like Sir Bedivere's figure as he strode across the frozen hills. The traveller, as he journeys across the arid plains of Iran in the tedious caravan, is ever looking backward or forward to some splendid range of mountains, the natural colours of whose cliffs as they rise abruptly from the plain, their summits crowned with snow, present a striking contrast to the burning sands of the desert. Seldom is his gaze directed to his immediate surroundings; he hastens forward to the hallowed city with its precious water, its waving palms, its towering cypresses, its mysterious fanes, its silent streets, its thronging bazaars. He hurries forward or he regrets the city he has left behind. So the interest of the Persian is divorced from his surroundings and centred in the distance of historical and mythical times. He lives for the past. In his mouth are the

quotations of poets of the olden time, who in their turn celebrated the deeds of heroes long antecedent to them. The libraries of the greatest nobles contain little else than the works of the classical poets—a knowledge of them ‘is a liberal education.’ A certain portion of every day is devoted to their study. An appropriate quotation makes a friend for life. A *fal* or ‘sors’ taken from Sadee or Hafiz determines the most important matters. A historian, an astronomer, or a poet is respected by all, and has a place of distinction in every company. But for a few shillings any schoolboy can turn off a copy of verses in honour of a stranger. There are many poets in Persia. The meanest artisan of the principal cities can repeat passages of the Persian classics; the rudest and most unlettered soldier will listen with rapture to the mystic love-songs of Hafiz. There is an instance on record of a native who, with no other pretensions to be a leader than a good voice and the ability to sing a song of the olden time, created a provincial revolution. But with all this worship of literature there appears to exist no spontaneity of invention at the present time. It may be that the constant looking back on the past has destroyed the capacity to grapple with the problems of the present, and that owing to this their compositions are little else than a literal imitation of their classics; or it may be that the old mine is exhausted, and that a new shaft must be sunk. A sentence out of Mr. Green’s *History of England*, referring to the period of English literature between the death of Chaucer and the Elizabethan revival, presents a literal description of the condition of Persian letters, if not actually of the present, at least of the previous generation.

The only trace of mental activity is to be found in the numerous treatises on alchemy and magic, on the elixir of life, or the philosopher’s stone, the fungous growth which most unequivocally witnesses to the progress of intellectual decay.

Yet since this was a passing condition, one may consider it not so much a decay as a stagnation of literary energy; the running stream was dammed by a temporary obstruction, but the water in the meantime filtered through the porous soil till it reached new germs of life beneath. The revival of English literature came from the middle classes; the dramatic movement in Persia springs from the lower under the leadership of the middle classes. And here we arrive at the second division of our subject, viz. that a national expansion or progression is necessary to the establishment of an original drama.

We are told that Mahomedanism is rapidly becoming extinct in Persia and giving place to Soofism and free-thought, that the contact with Western civilisation is resulting in the introduction of Western ideas. M. de Gobineau, however, whose keen good-sense has thoroughly analysed the Persian mind and pointed out its illogical character, indicates how far free-thought has in reality made its way. The Persian will

graft on to one system another quite at variance with it, and believe in both till the energy of youth yields to the repose of middle age, and he returns to orthodoxy. One is reminded of the beautiful poetical contradiction of thought in Mr. Fitzgerald's translation of the Soofee poet, Omar Khayyam,

The stars are setting, and the caravan
Starts for the dawn of nothing. Oh, make haste!

The Persian character is the reverse of analytical, the reverse of consistent. He resembles a child now haughtily reserved, now babbling his personal secrets. He shrinks from the commonplace of existence. His everyday ride must be varied with 'jereed' or some other boisterous game. It is a serious problem how to prevent the Persian from using the white telegraph insulators as marks for his bullets. He seeks to enliven the monotony of life with practical jokes. He will pardon any liberty for the sake of amusement. He has earned the title of Frenchman of the East, because of his intelligence, politeness, quickness, and agreeableness. He gauges a man by his powers of conversation. But passion and avarice have corrupted his better qualities. Hospitality—a virtue common to most nations early in their history and recommended in the Avesta—has degenerated into ostentation: and the host, during the entertainment, constantly endeavours to get the better of his guest in some point of etiquette; indeed the love of ceremony is carried so far that a noble travels at night with lanterns that indicate his rank. The ancient Persians, says Herodotus, were taught to ride, to speak the truth, and to draw the bow. Two-thirds of their education still remains the same, though the bow has been superseded by the rifle. But the truth is a stranger to Persia. 'Believe me, for, though a Persian, I speak the truth,' is a common form of asseveration amongst them. Mr. Morier and Lady Sheil agree in thinking that 'the people are false, the soil is dreary, and disease is in the climate.' The one redeeming point of honesty in Persian character appears to be his affection for his country. In the midst of the comfort and luxury of Western Europe and surrounded with its delicate meats and drinks, he is ever longing to be in his native land, to slake his thirst at the fountain-head of the far-famed wine of Shiraz, and listen to the rapturous odes of Hafiz. Such is the character of the Persian upper class, to all appearance incapable of spontaneous and combined movement; let us descend in the social scale.

Early travellers have told us how the constant shifting of the crown from usurper to usurper weakened the old nobility, and an aristocracy sprang up of adventurers whose interests ran counter to those of the true Persian. In most Eastern countries the aristocracy and official body have no sympathy with the inferior classes: in Persia this division is very strongly marked. Amongst the lower

classes of a European country we look for earnestness and conviction ; in the East, where character is more volatile and despotism unmitigated, we cannot expect to meet with these qualities in the same degree, but there are features in the constitution and social composition of Persia not to be found in other Mahomedan countries.

'The most absolute sovereigns of Asia are the slaves of public opinion,' says Sir John Malcolm ; and the monarch of Persia is exceptionally so, though her government has been called the most absolute of monarchies. Externally it justifies such a description.

'To maintain an opinion,' says Sadee, 'contrary to the judgment of the king, were to steep our hands in our own blood ; verily, were the king to say "This is night," it would behove us to reply "There are the moon and the seven stars."'

The king's will is law. A passionate or drunken word may cause to fall the head of the highest in the land. The circumstance of the Shah's court is truly despotic, for he is waited on by magnates who literally perform the menial offices indicated by the titles of European courtiers. When the Shah experiences that desire to wander which is the degenerate remnant of the nobler instinct that moved his nomad ancestors, he travels in a magnificent progress like a flight of locusts spreading desolation through the land. The poor man's fold is plundered, his crops are gathered, his store of sustenance for barren months impounded for the table of the royal wanderer ; and, in the words of Sadee, 'from the plunder of five eggs made with the sanction of the king, his troops stick a thousand fowls on their spits,' so that the advent of the sovereign among his people is far from a matter of rejoicing to them. They have been known to prevail on him to stay at home with offers of money. After the fashion of the Tudors, the reigning Shah makes away with possible rivals, or leaves them utterly wrecked and crippled for life. In this respect, however, the Kajars have reversed the policy of their ancestors. They no longer immure their princes in the Zenana till they become innocuous victims of sensuality, but send them as governors to the provinces, to plunder the people and save the coffers of the Statc.⁷ In the hands of the Persian despot rests unlimited patronage, and office is only coveted as a means of emolument. However there is another side to this dreary picture. The people possess weapons and safeguards which can in a measure protect them from oppression. The State ministers are men of low origin elevated by the king, and subject without restriction to deposition : accordingly this precariousness in their tenure of the seals renders them to a certain degree circumspect in their exactions, for the whole nation has free

⁷ Mr. Anderson relates a significant anecdote illustrating the present policy of the Shah. When Zil-i-Sultan (Nasr-ud-deen's eldest son but not the heir-apparent) presented, as is customary, his sword to the Shah, on the renewal of his appointment as Governor of Irak, it was inscribed with the pregnant motto

'The keenest edge wins the prize.'

access to the person of the king; and the reigning Shah, having usurped much of the power delegated by his predecessor to representatives, the despotic power of the throne has of late years become distinctly weakened.⁸ Similarly the publicity of the courts of law provides a considerable guarantee, even in Persia, against injustice; and, lastly, one of their most valuable privileges the people can command—the good offices of the upper priesthood as mediators with the king. I shall presently have to speak of the priesthood at greater length.

In the larger towns there is a system of trade-guilds, each presided over by an officer elected by the members of the guild, subject to the king's approval: these appointments, when once made, are hardly ever cancelled or interfered with. The chief magistrates are also selected from the inhabitants, and must of necessity be acceptable to them in order to be able to carry on their duties. They are often, it is true, compelled to be the instruments of oppression, but their sympathies are regulated by the interests which they have in common with their fellow-citizens. Sir John Malcolm considered the liberties of the townspeople in Persia well secured. Yet throughout that country the poorer classes have substantial grievances. The war against the encroaching desert can only be waged with the aid of money and perseverance, neither of which essentials is forthcoming in Persia. The proprietor of lands on the flat eastern coasts of England knows what it is to battle with the encroaching sea, but the desert is a far more deadly and insidious enemy. Every inducement is given by the Government and encouragement by the Church, but the desert is still advancing. 'The best districts in Persia,' says a traveller, 'are but an oasis surrounded with desert.' And it is at the expense of those struggling combatants with drought and famine that the State maintains itself, and that inducements are furnished to office-seekers. The noblemen and the richer merchants are almost privileged classes. But the spirit of the town populations, only in a lesser degree sufferers from extortion, has lately received a new element of freedom. In the victorious days of Persia, her troops were chiefly recruited from the nomad tribes. Soldiers drawn from this source had fifteen centuries before excited the admiration of Alexander the Great, and still create a favourable impression on the minds of the military instructors furnished by the civilised powers of Europe. But Persia has ceased to be a military power, and the occupation of these tribes is gone. Fath Ali broke the power of the Iliats, and the great Khans have disappeared. The Persian tribes never had the riches of the Turk tribes, and soon fell into abject poverty. They therefore graduated towards the towns, where in recent years they have established themselves as

⁸ The present Shah is aware of the instability of his power, and possesses a morbid, but not unwarrantable, dread of the antagonism of despotism and knowledge. This feeling he not long ago evinced by suddenly recalling from Paris thirty or forty young Persians, sent there to reap the benefits of Western civilisation.

citizens, and submit, for the sake of employment and a livelihood, to the same restrictions as the townspeople themselves. Yet such an acquisition of new blood has given a stimulus and breadth to their endeavours after emancipation. This composite body finds its natural leaders in the merchant class, who are but little amenable to the fiscal government, and who, having spent a considerable portion of their lives in civilised countries, are fully cognisant of the backward condition of their own country. Their sentiments, if not their interests, are antagonistic to the sentiments and interests of the aristocracy and the Government. Another element of freedom is the liberty of speech which all classes seem to possess.

The exercise of these influences on the lower classes does not, however, appear to have diminished their religious belief. It would seem as if, on the contrary, their intolerance towards the infidel was still on the increase, while the hatred of Sheea for Sunnee, however much it may be mitigated amongst the upper classes, has not abated its ancient virulence amongst the people. The old quarrel between the Imams and the followers of Yazeed remains as fresh in their minds as if it had happened yesterday. The Persian archer, when he shot his arrow into the air, Chardin tell us, cried 'May this go to the heart of Omar!' so, in modern days, the streets of the Persian towns echo to the monotonous chaunt of the workmen, invoking curses on the head of Omar.

Give me a brick then, my life,

sings the master-bricklayer,

And may the curse of God light on Omar!
Give me another now, my darling!
Omar will not have any luck.

The woes of Alee and the wickedness of Omar, Mr. Eastwick tells us, now form the subject-matter of the songs of itinerant minstrels. Their own hardships, and the natural disadvantages of their country, combine no doubt to keep the love of Alee and his followers in the minds of the people. Mr. Arthur Arnold gives a striking instance of this affection and veneration for the Imams.

I showed a sketch of Karbalâ (he says) to our servants and to a knot of bystanders, telling them what it represented. Immediately the picture was in danger: all tried to kiss it, to press it to their lips, and cried, 'Ah Husain!' with an expression of deep regret more true and tender in the ardour of sincerity than one expects to find uttered over a grave which has been closed for twelve centuries.

Husain is indeed the favourite of all Persia: love for him seems to have superseded veneration for the founder of Mahomedanism.

In the lower classes, then, in contradistinction to the higher social grades, we find earnest convictions together with a vague and hardly

realised desire for freedom favoured by local institutions: and we may reasonably expect therefore to discover traces of an extended popular movement. Such a movement is undoubtedly being accomplished, gradually and in silence, even while I write: the chief evidence afforded of it is the gradual transfer of popular influence from the higher ranks of the priesthood to the lower, and its chief symptom the development of the Passion-play.

The full significance of this shifting of the seat of popularity cannot be understood without a glance at these two bodies of ecclesiastics. Zoroastrianism was a hierarchy—Monotheism grafted on to Magian sacerdotalism. The importance of the priest is everywhere insisted on in the early history of Iran: it is laid down in the *Sudder* that good deeds are worth nothing without the approval of the priest as a passport to Paradise: the great king Ardasheer placed the highest value on an alliance between Church and Throne. Notwithstanding, however, that Persia stands alone among Mahomedan nations in this respect, the hierarchical and temporal powers have never amalgamated. The priesthood maintains an existence apart. It has a separate legal system over which it presides. It abstains from active politics. It shrinks from interference with the decrees of the temporal courts; but when it tenders its advice to the Shah that advice is seldom, if ever, neglected. Its dwellings are sanctuaries and its influence has often lightened the burden of cities. The principal ecclesiastics are called 'moojtahids,' and in them alone the chief privileges of the order are vested. All travellers agree in according them the highest respect; even Kaempfer, who is not otherwise complimentary to those priests, says the title of moojtahid 'is only granted to him who is master of seventy sciences, and even then he must be held in the highest consideration both by the king and the people.'

But the decline of the priesthood has long ago commenced and dates from the days of Nadir Shah, who pillaged the Church to pay his soldiery. Any change in their position of later years may be ascribed to the want experienced by the people for a class of instructors who would stand in closer relation to them than the canonised priesthood. The immediate cause of the perception of this want is not apparent, but in all probability is owing to influence from the West, to which the lower classes would presumably be easily accessible; for though the aristocracy receive an imperfect education, disproportionate to their social position, the lower classes, as such, are, it is said, well instructed. Thus, while the upper priesthood have gradually separated themselves from contact with the people and drawn closer to the throne, their places have been occupied by the popular friars, the *Said Roozé Khans*. These courtiers of the people did not receive a good character from Sir John Malcolm at the beginning of the century; and from a glance at this passage it will be readily perceived that a change has taken place

since his day. The Said Roozé Khans, he says, consist of pretended descendants of the Prophet, *moollas* who lay fictitious claims to learning, and *hajjees* who have gained a sort of cheap sainthood by having visited the holy city of Mecca. 'Take the ass of Jesus to Mecca; on its return it will still be an ass,' Sadi remarks of the Hajjees. In the words, then, of the English Herodotus, 'the lower ranks of the priesthood are seldom entitled to that praise which has been bestowed on some of the superior branches. They neither enjoy, nor can they expect popular fame. . . . So that we can believe that there is truth in those accusations which represent them as being equally ignorant, corrupt, and bigoted.' No historian of to-day could write these words of the supporters, the authors, the originators of the Passion-play of the Muharram.⁹ That it owes its origin to the Said Roozé Khans I will endeavour to make evident.

The dramatic element was existent in Persia centuries before it acquired the dramatic form. The *ballet* performed in Chardin's time was in itself a mute drama, and as complete as the similar representations in Turkestan at which Mr. Schuyler lately assisted. This seems to have survived in a curious dance of sixty-four of Husain's relations mentioned by Mr. Morier in his description of the tazyah in 1818. The story-tellers, too, presented in their own persons studies of many characters and passions; so vivid, indeed, were their impersonations that they moved to laughter and tears persons ignorant of the language in which their tales were told.¹⁰ Then there were the Marionettes, who, long before flesh and blood, trod the Persian stage. Of these the principal is the Punch, Kachal Pahlawan, of whom M. Chodzko gives a very interesting account. Kachal Pahlawan derives his name from his baldness, and is curiously typical.

⁹ There is no contradiction here, since the Passion-play had at this period attained little popularity, and Malcolm himself says that the Persians possess nothing worthy the name of drama.

¹⁰ Monsieur Ferrier gives so striking a description of a story-telling Said, that I cannot forbear quoting it *in extenso*: 'A tale indifferently well told, though most improbable in fact, will interest a Persian intensely, and if in a sermon the Syud thoroughly understands his business and arranges his subject skilfully, developing it by degrees, and in a way to rouse little by little the emotions of his hearers, which he will do easily by dexterously throwing in the marvellous and the sentimental, he reaches the climax: his voice falters, he is overcome with feigned emotion, and a deluge of tears is seen to flow down the cheeks of his audience. His own are always at his command; is he telling a tale, he is sure to shed them at the proper moment; for example, when his hero sprains his ankle, or wants to smoke and there is no kalia; but, if he is dying of thirst, or falls into the hands of the enemy, oh, then the groans and lamentations are past belief; the men cry like calves, the women like does, and the children bawl loud enough to make a deaf man hear; and the unfortunate victim who, like myself, is condemned to listen to all this trash, has no resource but to stop his ears, or resign himself to be kept awake by these scenes of desolating grief. The tale or sermon finished, the Syud proposes a cheer for the Prophet, and after that, one for Ali, the same for Houssein, for Hassan, for Abbass, for all the sainted Imams (and there is a long list), and lastly one for himself the Syud.'

of the Persian. He is the Persian Tartuffe, and the personification of a people in whom thirteen centuries of oppression have produced hypocrisy, dexterity of evasion, and suppleness of conscience. And lastly, this actual dramatic form has existed from beyond historical times in the strolling buffoons, the Eastern *jongleurs* or *lootees*, whose representations are varied with apes, bears, and jugglers, and whose impromptus bristle with local allusions, personal *bons mots*, and improprieties of word and action. But in Persia and throughout the East, as in mediæval Europe, these illiterary performances seem to have had little or no influence on the rise of the drama proper, which originated out of the Muharram ceremonies established nearly a thousand years ago. The burning of the body of Omar furnished one of the chief interests of these celebrations, and still survives. It is mentioned by Sir Antony Shirley in 1601: Abbas the Great,

first to extirpate intrinsic factions, then to secure himself more firmly against the Turke . . . had in use, once a yeere, with greate solemnitie to burne publicly, as maine Hereticks, the effigies of Omar and Ussen; then doth he cause his great men publickely (in scorne of their institution) to goe with a Flagon of Wine, carried by a Footman, and at every village where they see any assemblie of people to drink; which himself he also useth, not for the love of wine, but to scandalize so much more the contrarie religion, that by such a profaning of it they may wear the respect of it out of the people's hearts.

Another account of the burning of Omar is given by Herbert about a quarter of a century later, and contains a mention of the origin of the Passion-play in the prominence of the part played by the 'Caddy' who 'bawles out a pathetique oration.' But neither this nor the exceeding quaintness of the style justifies its insertion in this already too lengthy paper. A more pertinent quotation may be made from the works of Della Valle, who travelled about the same time as Herbert. The entire population is dressed in black, the streets are filled with naked fanatics, some painted black, others red, singing 'the praise of Houssein, and descriptions of his martyrdom; beating time with pieces of wood or ribs of certain animals, which produce a melancholy sound, and dancing all the while in the midst of the crowd.' At noon 'a mulla of the race of Mahomet' mounts an elevated pulpit and proclaims the virtues of Houssein, recounting the circumstances of his death, 'exhibiting occasionally to the people, extremely attentive to what he says, *certain figures representing the circumstances to which he alludes, and endeavouring to excite commiseration and tears.* This ceremony is likewise copied in the mosques and the most public parts of the streets, which are adorned and illuminated for the purpose; the audience, all the while bathed in tears, sighing and moaning, beating their breasts, and displaying the greatest affliction, frequently repeat, with much expression of agony, these last verses of one of their poetic monodies: 'Va Hassaun! Shah Hussein!'

We have in these quotations the history of the Passion-play very plainly indicated. The Persian nature is, as Mr. Morier says, peculiarly adapted for the drama: this is evident from the practices which existed in centuries gone by. The popular sentiment clung to the Muharram celebrations, the people felt themselves the modern types of the Imams, and the Sâids were required to excite those feelings of commiseration in which generous pity was mingled with selfish complaining. Whether the discourses of the preachers sometimes failed of their object, or whether a rivalry between them led them to adopt other means more effective than words, is a matter of conjecture; we find them, however, appealing to the eye with images of the Imams, and such a presentation was no novel idea; for many years the effigy of the hated Omar had been burnt with savage exultation by the populace. Then in the latter half of the last century we read of the Passion-play in the travels of Francklin as a recognised institution. The other point to which I drew attention, viz. that the Sâid Roozé Khans were the originators of the Passion-play, I think, admits of no doubt. The higher priesthood has constantly inveighed against these performances, nominally because the representation of life is contrary to the principles of the Koran and brings ridicule on their religion, but really because they perceive that the popularity of the Sâids involves the decline of their own importance. Stringent measures have been attempted to suppress the tazyah: the present Shah actually issued a proclamation to that effect, but it was without result. It has become part and parcel of the national life: in times of illness or calamity a number of tazyahs are vowed to Husain, just as Roman Catholics promise masses to the Virgin: and the ministers, to whom popularity is of paramount importance, like the Greek and Roman politicians of old, make bids with tazyahs for the favour of the people.

I may add another sign of change in the popular temperament, which is more significant than it at first appears. Chardin and travellers of his time note the costume of the Persian as bright and full of colour; but, according to the descriptions of travellers of the present day, the dress of the lower classes has now adopted a sombre tone.

Whatever direct refining influence may be exercised on the tazyah, it must of necessity come from within: for, though the tazyahs have profited already by imitation of the *technique* of Western theatres, the Persian play is a thing so peculiar in itself, that any modification of it in the direction of our manner of dramatic representation must be degradation.

As to the literary qualities of the tazyah, we find various estimates recorded. Francklin speaks of the elegance of its language, Malcolm and Morier are contemptuous over it; M. Gobineau so rapturous that M. Chodzko considers him suffering from the common

malady of translators. The tazyah, it seems, is written in the simple language which speaks to the hearts of the people, with the same avoidance of Arabisms that distinguished the patriotic poets; and, though to our ears its style may seem overburdened with florid imagery and involution, we must not forget that these are characteristics of all Eastern literature. We fail, however, to discover therein the grander elements of the Attic drama, or the rude but lifelike touches of humour and character that enlivened the mediæval moralities of Europe;¹¹ and since, like the Ober-Ammergau play, the tazyah resolves itself into a succession of pictorial scenes, there is an entire absence of that forcible language which accompanies definite action. The only relief which is afforded to the 'wo, wo, unutterable wo' of the whole representation is to be found in some pretty touches of child-life and the arrogant boasting of the Syrian enemies. In the irresponsibility of the dramatists—who, being an inferior order of clergy, write anonymously for fear of sacerdotal interference—the Tazyah is deprived of the ameliorating agency that arises from the rivalry of authorship: yet, the Shah and the aristocracy having become its patrons, men of real literary taste have been found to revise the versions which have become their property. The direct action of collective criticism by the audience on the text is peculiarly effective; as, throughout the performance, the whole body of spectators is expected to wail and weep, any portion of the text which fails of producing this result is condemned, and in the succeeding representation gives place to a passage of a more stirring nature.

Quand l'autel est souillé, la douleur est l'encens.

This catering for tears is not, of course, an unmixed good, from a literary point of view, but it brings together the auditorium and the stage in a manner incompatible with our civilisation and mixed audiences.

Another proof of the sensibility of the Persian, and one which relates to the necessity of purification of the manner, as well as of the matter, of the words uttered by the heroes of the tazyah, is the fact that the sympathetic characters speak in music, while the antipathetic personages are not allowed to ascend above the level of ordinary speech. (The same peculiarity is observed in the Chinese drama.) This curious distinction, paralleled in some degree by

¹¹ Mr. Mounsey describes a comic scene in which Yazeed is seated at a table covered with medicine bottles, attempting to cure himself of indigestion. His efforts are however, fruitless, until a messenger enters bearing the head of Husain on a platter, at which sight Yazeed's malady vanishes. There appears, however, to be no comic intention in this scene, which is a popular one. The writer of the eloquent article in the January number of the *Edinburgh Review*, 1880, remarks: 'There is no attempt to individualise characters. They are all alike and talk alike. The only trace of originality we can find is in the child Sukaina, who is perpetually screaming and defying all her aunt Zaineb's attempts at consolation.'

Shakespeare's use of prose and verse, necessitates a recognition by the audience of the merits of different performers. A boy with a good voice earns a handsome income, and, for the time being, is almost as much a notoriety as a Western histrionic genius, though boys are associated with 'the only really weak part of the performance,' the female rôles.¹² But beyond this there is nothing, not even applause, to give prominence to the individual actor, 'on ne témoigne jamais une admiration venant de l'esprit.' Were this not so the impersonator of the holy Imam would become an object of interest as well as the Imam himself, and the drama would speedily be secularised. The peculiar position of Ober-Ammergau has enabled it hitherto to resist the influence of idolisation, and thereby to preserve the sacred character of its Passion-drama. There is, however, one person connected, though indirectly, with the representation on whom the Persian audience vents its approval; he is the modern representative of the *choragus*; on him the success of the whole performance hinges. He does not retire behind the scenes when the play begins, but remains to form the connecting link between the actors and the audience; he makes audible comments and explanations; he solicits the pity of the spectators where he considers an exhibition of pity due; he arranges everything; he perfects the children in their parts, places them on the stage, buckles on the swords of the actors, and supplies them with anything they may require. He is recognised as the mainspring of the tazyah, and his person is sacred. He is called 'oostad' or master, a title which retains something of the simple reverence of the olden time. It is an act of piety, and a part of the performance itself, to present him with costly gifts. Many a rich shawl is handed to him in sight of the whole audience.

The excessive impressionability of the Persian precludes the necessity of any attempt at realism on the stage, and thus, while facilitating the expression of approval and disapproval, swamps the self-critical faculty, and creates a uniformly low standard of literary excellence. There is an entire absence of illusive effect in the dramatic accessories; and though here and there we find evidence of a feeling for æsthetic unity, all artistic propriety seems to be sacrificed to the attainment of barbaric magnificence.¹³ A vague and inharmonious

¹² The Persian music, which, as in all religious drama, heightens the effect produced by the representation, is of a very simple character, though the principal rôles are highly ornamented, and therefore necessitate considerable execution on the part of the performer. In the beginning of European musical history, and at the time of the Crusades, there can be little doubt that many of its salient features were borrowed from the East; Persia, for example, had developed a system analogous to that in use at the present day. Since then, however, she has made little progress in the musical art, and there, as throughout the East, the study of harmony is not practised.

¹³ The poles which surround the stage are covered with skins of wild beasts, and adorned with warlike weapons.

splendour reigns throughout the tazyah; and the actors—even the Prophet himself, who was wont to attire himself in the coarsest garments—are clad in the costliest and most brilliant apparel. There is no attempt to maintain the illusion of entries and exits, or differences of place and time; a distance of miles is represented by steps; an actor never quits the *sakoo*, but only withdraws to the side. A mark of distinction is conferred on the hero of the particular scene enacted by his being permitted to sit on a couch by the side of Husain. No scenery is possible, since there is no background to the stage. Chopped straw represents the sand of the desert, which is poured on the head in sign of grief, and a copper basin the waters of the Euphrates. It is evident that in a theatre where half the audience are gazing at the actor's back the finer touches of acting would be wasted, and it is curious to remark that, when we are spectators of acting in such or similar conditions, our intellect does not demand a greater artistic perfection than that of which the circumstances admit. This truth lies at the bottom of all progress in the histrionic art. We are not, therefore, astonished that the actors of the tazyah do not pretend to the science of the professional artists of Europe, but possess as their sole accomplishments grace of action and resonance of voice, which, combined with a natural simplicity and earnestness, render deeply affecting, even to persons ignorant of their language, the woes of 'the Family of the Tent.' They even carry their parts in their hands and refer to them when their memory fails them. It is with no feeling for art or verisimilitude that the Sheea attends the Muharram celebration; he is no rational being at this season, merely a fanatic. He goes to weep. Husain, he believes, 'will intercede in favour of every one who has shed a single tear for him.' The representatives of the brutal Syrian soldiers themselves burst into weeping as they insult the holy Imams. From the earliest times the *moollas* have preached the value of such an offering. Tears so shed were collected by the priests as a sovereign remedy against death. The sole object, therefore, of the dramatists is to elicit 'the passionate music of tears.'

Les sanglots (says M. Chodzko), tout aussi contagieux en l'Orient que le rire chez nous, devinrent de plus en plus bruyants et finirent par le cri spontané ou, pour mieux dire, par un rugissement d'un millier d'individus qui nous saisit d'effroi.

No artistic consciousness can reside in the minds of people so irrational as to incur the risk of death by suffering their bodies to be buried in the earth in order to represent the decapitated Imams, and who cannot restrain themselves from lynching the impersonators of the enemies of their country.¹⁴ Fanaticism is a dangerous, if not an insuperable, antagonist to any refining artistic influence, since it lacks,

¹⁴ In the little town of Damawand a fight annually takes place in which several persons are killed. But whoever dies during the Muharram goes to Paradise.

and militates against, the reflective quality without which progress is impossible.

The only question which seems now to remain for discussion is, whether the fanaticism will, or can, ever be toned down into the moderation requisite for development. Professor Lewis Campbell has truly said: 'Intense participation in a great cause, as in Dante and Milton' . . . is 'but little favourable to purely dramatic art.'

We find an upper class supporting the representation of the Passion-play, not so much from motives of patriotism as from a selfish desire to obtain popularity. It is possible that this feeling, which is entirely removed from fanaticism, may, first from the necessity of rivalling contemporaries, next from a true feeling for art engendered by such rivalry, familiarise the lower classes with the moderation necessary for the development of self-criticism. It may be, too, that the merchants who preside over the practical working of the Muharram celebrations will form for themselves a higher ideal, based on the master-pieces of foreign literatures, and so influence the people. But this is mere speculation. We must, however, signalise the absence of a great central metropolis which, in the case of all great European dramas, has always furnished a focussing centre and school of improvement. At present we can only console ourselves by pointing to the beautiful mosques at Koom, Ispahan, and other Persian cities, to the classic ruins of Persepolis, and—if the conjecture of Major Murdoch Smith be correct—to the famous Alhambra itself, as evidences of the artistic capabilities of Persia. The Muharram Play is not the cry of a people raising itself from oppression; it is not the outcome of regret for greatness that is past. The legends of the pre-Mohammedan kings and of the Persian Hercules have no place therein. It is a passive complaint for the misery of the present, the *dæmon* of a people that has discovered its own degradation. Art cannot exist on grief alone: it requires quiescence for its development, and quiescence implies a degree of prosperity. If we wish, therefore, to prognosticate favourably with regard to the drama in Persia, we must forget that its mosques and minarets are tumbling to decay, and that its precious tiles are trampled under foot by the passing traveller; we must forget the encroachments of the desert and the ravages of famine, and remember that it is still the desire of great nobles and influential ministers to leave behind them public works as memorials, and that the Persian may in the few weeks of spring, at Ispahan where nature assumes her loveliest garb, and around the classic walls of Shiraz, amongst the shubberies of cypress and orange with their beautiful latticework of light and shade, and their long and lovely vistas terminated by lordly mountains, together with the vision of possible happiness and content, store up materials for a literature

that will deal with the bright as well as the gloomy side of life.

The great danger is, that a vicious and effete administration may not survive to yield gradually to the pressure exerted upon it by an expanding and unanimous people, but may be swept away by a sudden invasion or revolution; and that the palace of art, its foundations undermined, should collapse, and the work of an age of peace be swept away by the violence of a moment.

LIONEL TENNYSON.

THE CHILD-CRIMINAL.

WHAT shall we do with the child-criminal ?'

This is the unanswered question of the day. Our Home Secretary, alive to its momentous import and the urgent need that it should be soon and satisfactorily answered, has recently invited opinions and suggestions respecting it from numerous quarters ; but up to the present moment efforts appear to have been for the most part futile to find the true solution of as difficult a problem as ever yet perplexed humanity.

'How shall we order the child, and how shall we do unto him ?' anxiously asks the politician of the philosopher, and the philosopher, in his turn, of the philanthropist. But the philosopher's brain, though exercised profoundly, has not yet yielded satisfactory response, and the heart of the philanthropist, stirred to its depths, sighs only, 'It is not in me.'

One fact is indubitable, viz.: that letting the child-criminal alone *now* offers no security for his letting society alone hereafter. The quick-eyed, ragged urchin, who just now transferred some trifling article from the shop-window to his trousers pocket, will in a few years (if his present pilfering be not prevented) develop into the desperate burglar, who will find a dozen ways of intruding himself into your dwelling by any other entrance than its front door. The squalid child of severe Mother Street, driven by hunger-gnawings to commit a petty theft for the breakfast which his search among the refuse heaps in the gutter fails to furnish, will soon, if unbefriended and unfed, master the easy rule of progression in crime. For example, a young acquaintance of ours, late in the Homerton Truant School, graduated, in a fortnight, from stealing twopence to taking a paraffin lamp, and from taking a paraffin lamp to driving off in a horse and cart not his own. And when, from constant practice, the child's nimble fingers have attained dexterity in the art of thieving, he will not only brag of his exploits among his young companions, but also initiate them in the tricks of his trade. Thus he becomes 'captain' of a gang of child-roguers, who drink in with avidity his thrilling tales of hair-breadth escapes from shopmen's and policemen's clutches, and eagerly covet similar experiences. Some

follow him, chiefly from that boyish love of adventure which a career of petty theft furnishes so many opportunities to gratify, while others join the band simply to satisfy the natural craving of empty stomachs for food otherwise not forthcoming. For instance, 'What did you steal?' we once inquired of a child, whose appearance failed altogether to suggest starvation. 'I stole half a crown, and spent it in sweets, and gave them to boys,' was the prompt reply. 'And what did *you* take?' we asked of a boy, of half-famished expression of countenance. 'Please, mum, I stole a lot of sausages, and ate them *raw*,' was the answer.

Yet the sad, half-famished, juvenile offender must no more be permitted to pilfer his daily bread, if we can hinder him, than the better fed, high-spirited child, who climbs your garden-wall with cat-like agility, may be suffered to rob you, because he steals more from love of boyish enterprise than of the sour apples which he flings to his companions, agape with admiration below.

And thus we watch for each, and we pounce upon each, and as one struggles, and the other snivels, in our firm grasp, we look almost hopelessly into each other's faces, asking the still perplexing question, 'What shall we do with them—how shall we deal with them?' If the court is sitting, the usual course is to take them at once before a magistrate, to whom Section 10 of the Summary Jurisdiction Act gives power to adjudge each a whipping of 'six strokes with a birch rod, either in addition to, or instead of, any other punishment.' But, if the magistrate be a humane man, he will probably regard the pale, thin child with a perplexed air, very doubtful of the potency of a whipping to prevent a boy from living to steal, who steals to live. Possibly, also, the words of the wise man may occur to him, 'Men do not despise a thief, if he steal to satisfy his soul when he is hungry.' He has less compunction in dealing with the lively, high-spirited offender. This is precisely the boy who does not *care* for a flogging, so he gets one, and goes whistling out of court to play his pranks again on society at his earliest convenience. But with regard to the half-starved child, *what* can the magistrate do with *him*? The inquiry, 'What shall he *not* do with him?' is far less bewildering; and we would earnestly exclaim, do not send him to prison, and, above all, do not order him to an industrial school, if he be a *little* boy, until *you have industrial schools solely* for the reception of *little* boys; but of *such* industrial schools more hereafter.

We say, do not send him to prison, if you would not hinder the advance of civilisation and humanity; for, despite the arrogant utterances of magisterial pomposity which have reached us from some of the provinces, we cannot be satisfied that all the fiats of our justices were unexceptionally wise which condemned 7,416 children in the year just expired to breathe the tainted atmosphere of prison life. Hundreds of these were offenders under twelve years of

age, some of them little fellows barely able to bring their matted heads and tear-stained faces to the level of the dock—creatures of neglect rather than of crime, living only to struggle, because every struggle was needed to live. Only very recently we heard a magistrate aver that children brought before him for theft and other offences were sometimes so *small* he was obliged to order them to be ‘lifted up’ that he might see them, and that occasionally so great was their terror of being locked up in prison cells that the gaol officials humanely placed them in the infirmary, fearing, if they did otherwise, the children might fall into fits through fright and be found dead in the morning. And if a large percentage of such children are adepts in the pilfering art, it is because many of them have no alternative but to steal, if they would not starve. The children of the very poor are not naturally more predisposed to dishonesty than the cherished children of the affluent, but their temptations to the commission of this sin are more pressing and abundant in proportion to their larger need. The babe born of a besotted woman in a dismal den, where no ray of sunlight penetrates the rag-stuffed window, is quite as guileless, tender, and innocent a creature, as susceptible in time of good impressions, and as capable of attaining moral excellence, under efficient training, as the infant in costly cradle, whose father is a peer of the realm. Let those two children change places and conditions. Take the coarse wrap from the beggar’s brat, and robe it in cambric and lace. Guard the babe from the *berceau* with holy and happy surroundings, and

Shed in rainbow hues of light
A halo round the Good and Right
To tempt and charm the baby’s sight.

Let it, as it grows, associate only with well-taught and well-bred children, sheltered carefully from contact with the vicious and the mean, and we hesitate not to affirm that when that child becomes a man you shall fail to trace upon his honest brow the faintest stain of infamous origin, or brand of ignoble birth. On the other hand, let the infant of high degree, by some terrible mischance, inhale only the impure atmosphere of vicious indigence among the brutal and miserable. Let him suffer from hunger, cold, experiencing none of the countless endearments which should ever fall to the lot of early childhood. A little creature, never without care, let him as he older grows listen only to the corrupt conversation of the depraved and the abandoned.

With ready and obedient care
To learn the tasks they teach him there—
Black sin for lesson, oaths for prayer.

Let him be cuffed, and kicked, and scolded, till he become almost insensible to rating and callous to blows. Let him be driven out into

the cold street to *steal*, if he cannot *beg*, the breakfast that none provide him, and see then if, despite his noble birth, he will not prefer to pilfer rather than suffer the pangs of hunger. Mark if he will not seize the milk-can on the door-step (meant to be presently taken in) and gulp down its contents as rapidly and cunningly as any low-born delinquent, and make off with feet as nimble to escape capture. Only leave that child among evil companions to pursue a pernicious course unchecked, and though he first saw the light in a ducal mansion, all too soon he may develop into the degraded felon, with slouching gait and hangdog expression of countenance. Vice is a heritage as surely and equally bequeathed to the children of the so-called 'better classes' as to the offspring of the poor; and if the former have no recollection, as they older grow, of the fields 'where cockles grow instead of barley,' it is that they were early led from them by virtue's path into healthier pastures, led by holy teachers, wise counsellors, and good companions. Crime contains contagion that is speedily communicated by contact, and let us not then too hastily censure an unfortunate child for sickening morally amid the pestilential exhalations of a dissolute locality. But when he *has* so sickened, and the malady is virulent enough to taint a whole district, let us be less anxious to deal out punishment to the sin-stricken child than to discover how best we may treat and isolate him, with the double object of preserving others from infection, and securing his own moral restoration. Therefore we rejoice that the public mind is stirring and the public voice protesting against the mistaken policy of committing young offenders to gaol in the belief that such a measure must be remedial of crime. Crime in the bud, which might be *nipped* in the *bud*, becomes crime full-blown, if the young plant be placed in a hot-house of moral unhealthiness; therefore it is not desirable that naughty little children with the imitative faculty strong and active within them should be early acquainted with the evil ways of adult criminals. It is not for *us* to make young eyes and ears familiar with the debasing sights and sounds which must occasionally be seen and heard wherever full fledged gaol-birds congregate; for the impressionable heart of childhood is even more yielding to the hideous stamp of vice than to the softer imprint of virtue, and vainly we shall essay hereafter to obliterate the deep disfiguring scar. We are aware that greater care has been exercised of late in isolating children as far as possible from adult criminals; but despite precautionary measures, young offenders often acquire in a gaol much objectionable knowledge.

But if we decline to lead young offenders through the huge gates of a prison, past dismal gratings, down long stone passages, to dreary cells, to be introduced one day perchance, through having undergone imprisonment, as apt learners, to practised villains who can strike with master-touch every note in the gamut of crime, and who are able as willing to communicate their corrupt knowledge—

if we will not commit them to gaol, *where* shall we place them? what shall we do with them? The great question with which we have to deal is *not*, how shall we most severely *punish* the child-criminal? but how shall we soonest and most surely effect his reclamation? If a neglected urchin of seven or eight strays in a forbidden path, will a *birching* prevent his future wandering there, when you send him back to tread it again, because you supply no guide to lead him into a safer way? The unhappy child of depraved parents, who breaks the law, will not be reformed by an occasional monition or even a sound whipping; what he needs for such reformation is to be *trained* to good behaviour under moral and religious influences; and training is not the result of spasmodic effort, but of a course of patient, continuous exertion. And *where* is he to get this training—and *from whom* shall he receive it? *Where?* The damp cellar or gloomy garret, which it were bitter irony to hallow and dignify by the name of home, is not a place well adapted for the giving of such a course of instruction; nor, if the magistrate wisely remands the juvenile offender to the workhouse, should he remain sufficiently long there to enter upon it.

To the workhouse it appears to us, under existing circumstances, best that he *should* be remanded, isolated entirely for a few days (if he deserve severe punishment) from the other children in an empty room or cell, in which he should be furnished with some manual occupation, and which he might be permitted to leave for half an hour, morning and afternoon, during the children's schoolhours, to take exercise in the airing-ground under the supervision of an adult pauper. After two or three days, if his conduct be good, he might be allowed to attend school, sitting somewhat apart from the rest of the scholars. When, pending the sessions, the time of remand is lengthened (occasionally lasting three months), if the child's behaviour has been uniformly good for three weeks, we see no objection to the treatment being relaxed under continuous watchfulness. A child-criminal should not be permitted (even in a workhouse) to sleep in the same room with other children. His bed were better placed near some trustworthy adult's, who would take charge of him at night.

For *very* young offenders solitary confinement is seldom desirable, save for short periods during daylight hours. Darkness fills the cell with imaginary terrors, all too real for the timid child, and permanent injury to the brain has frequently resulted from fright.

But as to the requisite *training* of such children, if hovel and workhouse fail to furnish facilities for teaching them better habits of life, *where* shall we educate them?

And here, before we proceed further, let us remark that in this paper we are treating solely of criminal *children*, *not* young *persons*.

Under the Summary Jurisdiction Act, a child remains a child

under the age of twelve. A young person is a person who is of the age of twelve and under sixteen. And for suitable establishments, in which to commence the training process for reforming juvenile offenders (numbers of whom are only seven, eight, or nine years of age), we have at present searched in vain (it may be for lack of fuller information) among the two hundred inspected reformatory and refuge schools in England, Scotland, and Wales. Most that we have visited, read of, and heard of, appear to us *unsuitable*, and for this reason. Little boys 'found wandering,' lively children caught playing mischievous pranks from sheer overflow of animal spirits, and children of tender age, convicted of petty theft (theft in many cases perpetrated only to appease the pangs of hunger), are all relegated to industrial schools without classification of age, or regard to degree of crime committed, there to herd with older offenders, many verging on sixteen years of age, and experienced enough in the ways of evil to tutor new-comers in vicious habits, of which they were in total ignorance before entering the school. We would not for a moment be so misunderstood as to allow our readers to doubt our cordial sympathy with the philanthropic labours of many self-denying managers of *well-conducted* industrial schools.

We believe they are doing, and have done, a great and beneficent work, in rescuing numbers of children from degradation and crime, and by subjecting them to salutary influences, under which they learn to start afresh in the paths of honesty and usefulness. Yet we cannot but express our belief that the promiscuous intercourse of children of tender years with 'young persons' of fifteen or sixteen years of age is sorely prejudicial to the interests of the younger.

We would not soil our pages by doing more than *hint* at abominations that creep into schools through this mingling. Enough that we are sufficiently aware of their deep gravity to feel that we cannot be true to the children's interests if we pass them over without that slight indication of their existence which may prompt the good and thoughtful to the use of means which would make corrupt practices impossible in industrial schools.

The small window in a master's chamber, through which he may peer into the boys' long sleeping-apartment when noise or confusion arouses him, is practically useless for complete supervision. Yet this supervision should be thorough and incessant by *night* as well as by day, because it is essential to the moral prosperity of a school where criminal 'young persons' and children are gathered under the same roof. Therefore we shrink not from avowing our belief that if these 'young persons' do not retire to rest in the *same* rooms as those occupied by labour and school master, and at the *same* hour, the services of the night-watchman are as indispensable in their dormitories as in the workhouse casual ward. It is more than depressing to be compelled to fear that under the surface sparkle,

often described in inspectors' reports, of 'clean, bright, healthy, and well-cared-for' children,' a dark under-current of secret vice may silently flow. 'Do you talk after you go to bed?' said a friend of ours to a little fellow in an industrial school. 'Oh yes,' was the reply; 'no one comes near us when we're in bed, and so the big boys often get up and show us how they used to pick pockets;' and it would be well for the little ones if their instruction in evil were confined to picking pockets. Thus we turn reluctantly from many industrial schools as at present arranged and governed, still in quest of suitable trainers and suitable training institutions for juvenile offenders. And what, let us inquire, are the indispensable requirements of a young child, in order that it may grow up virtuous, well-behaved, and respectable? They are but *two* in number—a *good mother* and a *decent home*—and it may be superfluous to remark that the two rarely exist apart. And if the good mother and the decent home are absolutely necessary for his moral and physical welfare, and he becomes an offender from lack of either or both, is it not plainly a pressing and a public duty to attempt the child's reformation by supplying the deficiency as far as possible? And can this be done more effectually than by the provision of artificial advantages, closely resembling those he would have enjoyed had his natural (or unnatural) mother and his home been of desirable character? If a child be motherless, or worse than motherless, he yet sorely *needs* and *craves* for a mother. If he be homeless (though perchance not houseless), he still *requires* a home. Love of mother is the strongest passion in a child's breast. Wilful, stubborn, and disobedient though the girl or boy may be, or base and cruel the abandoned mother's conduct, the love through all is still abiding.

Terrible and touching was the tale, and painfully illustrative of the truth of our statement, which reached us a few months since from an industrial school in the south of England. A boy, for some offence not uncommon among neglected children, was sent from a wretched home and a drunken mother (so at least she was described) to the school in question. There he so bitterly and continuously bemoaned his separation from her, that reason lost her balance, and the child was removed to a lunatic asylum. We read a statement from the doctor who attended him, attributing his insanity solely to grief for enforced separation from his mother. We are glad to add that when sufficiently recovered to leave the asylum, his discharge was obtained and he returned to his home.

And not one whit the less than well-nurtured children do so-called 'waifs and strays' stand in need of home comfort and mother-care; and if society would be free from the annoyance of grown-up 'waifs and strays' hereafter, let it place them in early childhood under the training of as good foster-mothers as can possibly be found for them, in houses as much resembling plain family homes as it can make them.

The low villains who insult women, garotte and plunder, and make lonely walks after dark unsafe, were once neglected little boys, whose energies went into the *wrong* instead of the right direction, and who became bad men as they are, because none deemed it worth their while to provide them when young with shelter under good women's care.

Religion and education are attempting much, and *doing some thing*, to thin the ranks of what are termed 'the dangerous classes,' and our industrial school reports inform us that a large percentage of the children once in the schools are 'doing well.' Yet we cannot but be dubious of the well-doing of many of the children so reported on, and there will be scant lack of recruits to fill the gaps, if we do not materially alter the treatment of the bulk of our neglected and criminal children. It appears to us that institutions, closely resembling family homes in their domestic arrangements, might very usefully be provided for such children by the *State*, not in any case by *school boards*. Members of school boards have already abundant occupation in supervising the educational training of children who have not 'lapsed into crime,' and a task of this amplitude may well suffice them. There are other than themselves, specially gifted men and women, social and moral reformers, peculiarly adapted to undertake the reclamation of young offenders—men and women who would engage in this important work *con amore*, regarding it as their true vocation.

The annual reports of the cottage homes of Farningham for little boys, and also those of the industrial homes of Mettray in France, chronicle many happy results from the introduction of the family element into these institutions. In many respects we might follow their lead with advantage, although we believe that criminal children under the 'young person' age would derive even larger benefit from *womanly* care and management, whether boys or girls.

Homes, sufficiently large for the reception of fifty or sixty children (of whom none should be above ten years of age when admitted), managed by well-educated and competent women, are real necessities for our destitute and criminal boys and girls. Two or three such women, a care-taker, and a cook, would adequately staff each home. If the home be in the vicinity of a good school, the children might be marched thither morning and afternoon (or, as half-timers, morning *or* afternoon), reaching the school a quarter of an hour after the assembling of the ordinary scholars, and leaving it, when called for, a few minutes later or earlier than the rest take their departure. Thus all danger to the regular scholars from moral contamination of criminal children would be avoided. Prayers would, of course, be offered in the home, and religious instruction given to the children prior to their going to school. And they would probably walk thither *three* abreast (where the width of the footway permitted)

rather than in couples, for the prevention of small, mischievous confidences, seldom entrusted to more than one pair of ears. The boys or girls of the home should play in their own recreation ground, and practise drill there also. Nor, if we bear in mind the proficiency of many women in this healthful exercise, need we hastily conclude that the services of the drill-sergeant must be requisitioned to have it taught efficiently.

Some of our existing industrial school buildings might with advantage be converted into homes of the character indicated, each home staffed by an adequate number of women under a matron-superintendent.

Every institution of this kind should have a few rooms specially designed for the reception of new juvenile misdemeanants, who might be sent at magisterial discretion at *once* to the homes rather than to workhouses and prisons. The specific offences with which these children were charged, their circumstances, mode of living, and previous history, as far as known, should be communicated to the matron by the officer who conveys them to the home. And we fully concur with our Home Secretary that officers whose duty it is to look after juvenile delinquents should be *State* employés, as in the United States of America. If the selection of the matron has been wisely made, the corrective or penal treatment of the children may be safely left in her hands. Her discipline will be firm and effective, but she will rarely, if *ever*, resort to the use of corporal punishment. Her vocation is to soften the hardened, to win the child's confidence, and to lead wandering feet back into duty's path; and the birch is not exactly the instrument to promote these desirable ends. Without affirming that its use is *never* beneficial, we differ *in toto* from those who believe it a universal corrective. So long as children vary in *physique*, sensitiveness, and bent of disposition—so long as circumstances under which they commit offences differ—the same amount and kind of correction cannot judiciously be administered to each and all without distinction and discrimination.

The same punishment for the same misdemeanour might be too lenient in one case, and unduly severe in another. Temporary isolation and detention in bed during daylight hours for youthful offences have a deterrent effect which the birch sometimes fails to exercise. At all events a suitable matron may be entrusted to administer correction suitably. And on the selection of a suitable woman to fill this responsible position the prosperity of the home must wholly depend. Among a host of ladies of culture and irreproachable character, able to produce high testimony from high quarters to their excellence and varied ability, *few* would really possess the special qualifications requisite for the true parental oversight and government of the large neglected families to gather in the homes. Yet, though this be so, there are good women enough to be found among us, suffi-

ciently courageous, able, and enthusiastic to undertake cheerfully, and perform successfully, the onerous duties which as home-mothers would devolve upon them,—women of tact, fertility of resource, organising talent, unlimited patience and self-devotion—women diligent without fussiness, large-hearted without laxity—calm women, seldom dull—firm women, not often stern—women who can be strict disciplinarians, without inspiring their charge with slavish fear—loving, motherly women, who, while careful to retain their authority, know how to win the full confidence of their foster-children, develop their kindly affections (cruelly stunted in growth), and kindle in them noble ambitions and aspirations—vigilant women, observing everything, yet at times seeming to see nothing—pious women, whose daily conduct bears the quick, incessant watchfulness of childish glances that detect no inconsistency. Women, such as we describe (and such women *there are*) would be centres of influence and affection in homes for criminal and neglected children, whose power for good it were impossible to estimate.

Only let us *have* these institutions governed by such capable women, and we may safely leave the selection of competent assistants in their hands. They would enlist the services of young women with a natural love for children, able (or willing to *make* themselves able) to instruct the boys or girls in cookery, laundry and house work, knitting, netting, sewing, patching, and darning; clever also in some light and useful handicraft, such as paper-bag or card-box manufacture, fret-work, chair-caning, or slipper-making. Articles made by the children might be disposed of at an annual sale, the proceeds of which would augment the funds of the home. The caretaker should be a ‘handy man,’ with some knowledge of the use of carpenters’ tools, which he might impart to the young inmates of the institution. We once met with a man of this type in a day industrial school in Liverpool, attended by an average of 100 boys and girls under female superintendence. He was the only man upon the premises, an active fellow, and an excellent mechanic. He had voluntarily gone to prison for a week to learn list-slipper making which he taught the children, as well as chair-caning and wire-sieve manufacture. Wood-chopping, though to a certain extent a healthful exercise, either for boys or girls, should not furnish their *sole* industrial occupation. It is monotonous, and awakens no industrial intelligence. When incessantly practised it injures that delicate sense of touch required in some trades and occupations which the children may hereafter follow. The numerous wounded little hands, strapped with plaister, which we have frequently noted with regret, and even occasionally a missing finger-joint, long ago convinced us that wood-chopping is not suitable as a constant occupation for young children in industrial schools. Children taught to make and mend their garments may in time earn good livings as tailors and

dressmakers, but those whose days are wasted in wood-chopping *only* will *only* be wood-choppers. Should a garden be attached to the home, its cultivation will supply the children with healthful and profitable employment. The matron will encourage the planting of useful herbs, such as mint, thyme, sage, &c. (all easily grown), which when gathered and dried furnish small hands with abundant occupation in stripping the leaves from the stalks, rubbing them to powder, and storing it in bottles for sale and household use. She will also permit the children to rear and tend a few dumb animals, knowing that restless boys and girls are less likely to abscond, when in doing so they must desert domestic pets, dependent for life upon their daily feeding and care. Once visiting an industrial school, indifferently provided with common comforts, containing 100 children, many of whom were out at elbows, and had a weakly, ill-fed appearance, we learned with some surprise that, though the house-door frequently stood open, attempts at absconding were rare. However, we soon saw the explanation of this in the playground, where some leggy cockerels strode among a flock of pigeons, and a large mongrel lay basking in the sun. Here were the loadstones whose powerful attraction held the children to the spot.

The home-mother will also be anxious that her boys or girls should have suitable and durable clothing. She will prefer to be supplied with flannel rather than with cotton for their under-garments, to be worn summer and winter by children of either sex. Thus covered they will be less liable to contract illness through the chilling of the skin during perspiration. The boys' shirts will button *behind*, not in *front* of the neck, that when at work without jackets their bare chests are not exposed, as we so frequently see them in industrial schools. She will be specially solicitous that the children's feet are not harmed by misfitting boots. Chilblains are a veritable plague in some of our schools; and though we do not believe they are *always* preventible, we are of opinion that their number might be materially decreased, and their type become less aggravated, were proper attention given to the coverings of the feet. Even the close pressure of a boot round the ankle frequently creates chilblains on the toes. If the circulation is impeded, the foot becomes cold and chilblains appear. We have seen children in sore distress, and unable to walk, in industrial schools, whose misery was simply the result of wearing tight boots. Chilblains, or frost bites, wait on dampness as well as coldness, and therefore boots should *never* be worn by children *inside* a school. Much suffering might be obviated by placing slippers in rows on the floor of a small room near the entrance door, which the girls or boys should put on immediately they enter the house. Lines might be stretched overhead, on which the children could hang their boots to dry, either by the laces or simple S hooks, in the loops behind. So, less dirt would be carried into

the institution, and the constant washing of its floors rendered unnecessary.

With regard to the dietary scale of the home, considerable latitude should be allowed the matron in arranging it; for we cannot but arrive at the conclusion that cutaneous eruptions would be rarer than they are among industrial school children, were they supplied with food in greater variety. When fresh vegetables are cheap, they should eat them freely; and when these begin to fail, white cabbages may be sliced and placed in vinegar for household consumption. The cabbage procured for a penny may save the spending of a pound in curing skin disease, and it has the advantage of being as ready for eating the day after pickling, as it is good for months to come. There is no necessity to give the children the vinegar. This may be utilised to pickle another cabbage after the first has been consumed. Rows of giant rhubarb should also be grown in the grounds of industrial schools fortunate enough to have gardens. The stalks of this useful vegetable may be pulled till late in the autumn, and, when stewed and eaten with rice by the children, are wholesome as palatable. And with rhubarb the first expense of planting it is the *last*, as once placed in a garden it will be found there ever afterwards. We are convinced that scalp humours, so common among school-children, frequently break out in consequence of an insufficient supply of green vegetables; therefore turnip-tops (when abundant), should be supplied them freely, and large Portugal onions (when cheap) might, chopped fine, usefully supplement the bread-and-cheese dinner.

Coarsely-ground Scotch oatmeal, prepared after Mrs. Buckton's receipt, we prefer to cocoa for the children's breakfasts. We are of opinion that it is not true economy, nor is it desirable, to apportion them bread by *weight*. Children's appetites vary as widely as their dispositions, and frequently one child may leave a part of his portion, while another of the same age arises from the meal still hungry.

In a school which seemed to be conducted on the *laissez-faire* principle—for each child appeared to a certain extent to do what was right in his own eyes—we observed tame rabbits in the playground, feeding in their hutches off piles of pieces of bread. These pieces, we ascertained, were the leavings of some of the children at meals. From another school we heard of boys stealing six quartern loaves at once, from the larder to appease the pangs of hunger, one child averring that he was so famished as to feel compelled to 'stuff the sheet' in his mouth when he went to bed.

We were glad to meet with an industrial school in the North of England where the children at meals were wisely permitted to have *as much as, and no more* bread than they required.

The sleeping arrangements of the family in the home will be duly considered by the matron, and she will doubtless represent to the female Government inspector of industrial homes (should the State

wisely appoint one) or to her committee of lady-managers, the desirability of her own and assistants' dressing or sitting rooms opening into curtained spaces within the children's dormitories. There their beds should be placed, so that no sound should escape the ear. Much expense would be avoided if the Industrial Schools Act were so amended that probational sentences might be passed upon some juvenile offenders. Six or twelve months' detention in a home under wise womanly supervision might effectually accomplish the reclamation of many children of respectable parents. And here we would suggest that parents in good circumstances should always be required to pay so largely to the support of their offspring, that keeping them at home would prove a lighter burden.

In fixing amounts of contribution of parents to their children's maintenance, a distinction should be drawn between the vicious and the destitute. The former are frequently in a position to pay the full cost of their children's keep in industrial schools; and any measure enacted by the Government, to permit local authority to enforce such payment, will be hailed with universal satisfaction. With the destitute the case is altogether different; but should their circumstances improve, they ought not to remain exempt from contributing to the support of their children. The permanent removal of children from the influence of vicious parents is most desirable, and emigration opens a wide door of hope to these young unfortunates, after they have undergone a course of salutary training in industrial homes. Every effort should be used to induce depraved parents to consent to a separation so likely to be promotive of their offspring's welfare; or, failing these, the children should be placed in situations where they would be lodged and fed as far from their wretched homes as possible.

If situations are not to be found, or it be deemed expedient for the boys or girls to experience a longer course of training, they must pass from the home and sole female supervision into schools for 'young persons' under male and female superintendence. Probably some would find their way to industrial training ships, but only stout and healthy boys, with a strong bias for sailor-life, should be received in these. Weakly lads' constitutions soon succumb to the inevitable exposure to which such training subjects them, and the special and expensive preparation required for a seafaring life is often thrown away even upon the healthy. In 1879 there occurred on the 'Mars' industrial school ship (Dundee) no less than six deaths among the 355 lads, 'a very large mortality' as the inspector remarks. In the 'Akbar' reformatory ship (Liverpool) there were three deaths in the year 1879 among 174 lads, and seven boys discharged on account of disease. On the 'Clarence' (Birkenhead), 230 boys, there were four deaths in the same year, and three discharged from disease. On the industrial training ship 'Cumberland' (Dumbarton), 377 boys, there were eight deaths in 1878, and in 1879 three children died, and

twelve were discharged on account of disease. The inspector has good cause to remark, 'Greater care should be exercised in the reception of cases suitable for sea-service.' The London School Board training ship 'Shaftesbury' commenced receiving boys in August 1878, and at the end of 1879 had 350 on board; yet though the net cost of these children per head annually, including profit or loss on industrial departments, was 31*l.* 16*s.*, we find that up to December 1880 out of forty-one discharged fourteen boys only had gone to sea. Thus an expensive education for nautical life is frequently thrown away upon children who are either physically unfit or unwilling to become sailors; and as parental consent is also necessary to the disposal of boys in sea-service, it would be well if industrial school committees obtained such consent previous to sending lads to training-ships. Ships, of all dwelling-houses, are the most costly; and as the substitution of steam for sailing vessels daily decreases the demand for sailor-lads, the State will probably wisely decline to certify any more training-ships than we have at present.

As we just now hinted, a competent lady-inspector appointed by Government would more efficiently supervise homes containing young children than any gentleman, however capable and well qualified for his work he may be. Women are usually better acquainted than most men with the causes and nature of childish ailments, and with simple remedies for their removal or alleviation; they have more 'nous' in dealing with the refractory and sullen, and more tact in devising and directing what means may be best employed for the varied treatment of children of varied constitutions and dispositions. Therefore, should the State see fit to make an appointment of the character indicated, we may reasonably augur that it will result in sensible advantage to our criminal children.

The home-mother will gladly avail herself of the counsel and sympathy of a well-selected body of lady-managers, whose duty it shall be to visit the institution and inspect its management at will. These ladies will report monthly to the inspector of the prosperity or otherwise of the home, every fresh admission being noted in their report, and the circumstances of the child's parents, together with the amount they believe them able to contribute towards his or her maintenance, being also recorded therein.

The managers should also have full liberty to impart religious instruction to the children on Sunday afternoons or evenings, and to invite a few persons of well-known Christian character to assist them in such useful labour. In homes such as we have described, how much happier would be the condition of mere infants of the tender age of seven, whom we so frequently compassionate when we note them among children of larger growth in industrial schools!

The sick among the little ones would also derive much benefit from feminine ministrations, and we should then be less likely to be

pained, as we were a short time since, by the sight of a child suffering from hip-disease, lying in a room whose walls were washed with melancholy blue, with no single coloured print to brighten them; nor had the poor fellow even a broken toy or picture-book to beguile his weary hours. We were not surprised at the remark of a friend who visited the school with us: 'Were I shut up long in this doleful place, I should certainly lose my reason.'

And now that the Home Secretary is devoting his attention to the proper treatment of juvenile offenders, and collecting opinions on this important subject from magistrates all over the kingdom, we confidently anticipate the revision of the statute law with respect to industrial schools at no distant date. And when the whole question shall come before Parliament, we devoutly trust that however the State may decide to deal with '*young persons*' convicted of crime, it may wisely decree that criminal *children* shall be placed under feminine supervision.

ELIZABETH SURR.

REFORM OF FEUDAL LAWS.

THE condition of our land laws in England presents to us a vast problem, one which in its whole bearings on the social welfare of the people is often little recognised; yet there is hardly a question of political interest to the country which is not more or less indirectly influenced by them; and there is no subject which, during the next few years, will form so important a controversial public question. The entire fabric of modern society, of which our aristocracy is the leading feature, is deeply interested in this great question, and the very permanence of the order is menaced in the changes that may take place. Nevertheless it will be the conviction of all thoughtful and serious persons that the sooner the whole subject is not only brought up for discussion but is satisfactorily dealt with by the Legislature, the sooner will certain grave dangers to the stability of our national institutions be removed.

It is marvellous to any observer who has had the advantages of foreign travel, and who has used his opportunities with intelligence, to notice the total and fundamental contrast which exists not only between the land systems prevailing abroad and in England, but also between the social and intellectual condition of the agricultural classes in England and on the Continent. The enormous wealth of the landed proprietors of England, their paramount social influence over the lower classes, their considerable political power, and the class feeling which binds them together, notwithstanding slight differences of party feeling, into one great freemasonry of common interest, stands in vivid contrast with the degraded condition of our agricultural labourers and working classes generally.

In order to analyse this problem we should note the consequences which have resulted in England from the long survival of our feudal land laws, not only in the upper classes of English society, but also on the general condition of the whole people, especially on those classes more or less engaged in the cultivation of the land; we should trace further the natural effect which must result if reform of these laws was to be long delayed; and lastly, taking note of the mode in which this problem has found its solution in other countries of the Continent, we may consider the merits and demerits which can be urged in

favour of the various existing customs abroad, especially the claims of those who advocate the creation of a body of cultivating owners of land. Thus we shall arrive at a knowledge of those modifications which must be brought about in the laws of this country so as slowly, and with as little injury to individual or class interest as is possible, to bring about those great changes which are necessary to stimulate the diffusion of wealth and landed property more widely than heretofore throughout the people of this country.

The condition of Ireland at the present time offers us many valuable suggestions for selecting a path of wisdom in dealing with the land problem in England, and avoiding those evils from which the present race of landowners in Ireland are suffering; evils, too, of very ancient date, yet traceable distinctly to causes which have been slowly and surely operating to create a very gulf between the interest of the propertied classes on the one hand and the poverty-stricken tenantry on the other. Absenteeism and the deputed management of estates may have had much to answer for in the past in Ireland, yet to-day no amount of personal residence or paternal management of a property will weigh in the scale; the divergence of interest between classes is complete; the contest of feeling has become too acute to be adjusted by any act of propitiation by the one class to the other. There is an ingrained feeling of antagonism existing on all sides which has extended itself as a canker into the very heart of social relations in that country, manifesting itself in the socialistic propaganda of the Land League and the bitter outcry against English rule. It was to causes not very dissimilar to these that historians have attributed the origin of those great political movements which have resulted in a land revolution in almost every country of civilised Europe, and it is therefore of the highest importance that this state of things, which fortunately has no existence as yet in England, should not be allowed to take root. Small symptoms of discontent are not wanting; though labourers and farmers' leagues are but in their infancy in England. The remedy is as yet entirely in our own hands. The wretched plea of the Tory party that the national faults of the Irish character were the chief cause of the present political crisis is a most disastrous doctrine to rely upon, and the theory of relying perpetually on force alone to allay a popular movement which has been growing for generations is a feeble cure for such deep-seated evils. A political party that argues thus has purposely blinded itself to the testimony of history, if they think that in the long run the movement of a whole people can be extinguished by repressive measures.

The ineradicable fault in Ireland, if it lies anywhere, is to be found with those who believe that a system can be indefinitely preserved which has permitted 744 individuals to become the owners of half the soil of Ireland, while 1,942 owners possess two-thirds of the 20,000,000

acres which this country contains. The entire population of cultivators are thus divorced from the only important source of industry which the country possesses, since in the face of the protective laws regarding entail and settlement the divisions of estates into small parcels has been carefully prevented, and it has thus been hopeless for the cultivating class ever to look forward to becoming owners of landed property, or to have any goal of prosperity or contentment to strive for. Labourers must be labourers, tenants nothing more than tenants, all their lives; the only hope they could cling to being that their rents might not be raised, and that in times of distress they might be supported by largesses from the great territorial landlords, or by a demoralising system of public charity.

Can a more degrading state of things than this be conceived to the moral and social well-being of a people? Can a more fertile seed-bed be provided for hatching out every communistic theory, every wild socialistic idea? The origin of the evil is lost in the dispute, the true lines of liberal legislation are discarded, abuse and hatred is levelled not at the exaggerated results of unfair laws of property, but at the English Government, because the State does not step in and divide the land *gratis* among an ignorant peasantry—‘landlordism is to be abolished,’ ‘the land of the people is to be nationalised,’ ‘the land-grabber is to be hunted down.’ Surely to any rational mind there is food for reflection here? Can we wonder then that moderate statesmen stand confounded often at the difficulties of their task? On the one hand we are saddled with the incubus of these wretched land laws, of which nothing but time can moderate the effects; while on the other we are besieged with the rampant appeals of demagogues, who are steadily preaching a most dangerous social revolution.

There is no great middle class in Ireland composed of manufacturers, intelligent traders, shopkeepers, and farmers to moderate the political tide of socialism. There is nothing but the few helpless, land-logged, mortgage-bound landlords, and the huge struggling class of indigent cultivators.

Does any one suppose for a moment that if it were not for the influence and power of England we have here the elements of a social revolution on the most complete scale, which, of its own accord, would manifest itself without a day’s delay. The people would rise as one man against the owners of all property, and abominable crimes of every description would be committed. Forsooth, we have only to thank our good fortune that we can consider this problem to-day while England is untainted by this same antagonism of classes, and thus we may yet solve in time a social problem which possesses potentially factors of the most dangerous and far-reaching character, which the Tory party have too long had the audacity to disregard.

It has in good sooth been truly said that a beneficent genius has

heretofore watched over and guarded the ivy-grown walls of our ancient social monuments in England, and in the words of Pitt, in one of his speeches to the House of Commons after the French Revolution, 'The spires and domes of ancient buildings arise again above the flood which has so nigh overwhelmed them completely.'

So may it ever continue to be the case in England! Let those though who have studied history turn over once more its pages to the period of the great French Revolution, a revolution such as the history of the world affords us no parallel, extending its influence far beyond the confines of the French territory, and producing a cyclone of political disruption of which France was the centre chief seat, manifesting itself therein by a reign of terror and of political atrocity and crime, which for centuries will afford food for the calm contemplation of the psychological philosopher, and a subject for grave and careful study to the intelligent statesman.

Yet the voice was not in the tempest for us in England; the whirlwind of revolution passed by us and England's institutions remained. By slow degrees, and in former times, through the liberalising influence of the early Reformation and the wise conduct of patriotic statesmen, we had modified the social abuses of the Church and feudal nobles, which in other countries were the immediate cause of the storm.

The revolution of 1640 had once for all asserted the right of the public to being the supreme arbiters in matters of the general weal; the people ruled through their representatives to this extent that no well-defined expressions of public opinion could ever be safely ignored by English statesmen. Hence, at a time when all around abroad was ruin, there survived in England the remnant of former land laws and customs in our Constitution which, in other countries, had been ruthlessly swept away or destroyed. A compromise also in the shape of the great Reform Bill of '32 was eventually effected between the people and our ruling classes, which, with small modifications, has existed down to the present day. By this compact the English people secured to themselves the full advantages of party government and of popular representation, while it left untouched those greater matters regarding the rights of property which have tended to preserve in the hands of the privileged class the sole ownership of the soil in England.

The solution, however, was bound to come, and for years tokens have not been wanting that the struggle could not long be delayed. For many years past able writers on political economy, both in England and abroad, have written on the English and Irish land questions. Able statesmen also, like the late Mr. Cobden and Stuart Mill, have warned us that our condition in England touching the laws encouraging a monopoly regarding land, and the powers of settlement and entail, were the chief cause of the ignorant and miserable condition

of our lower classes, which, working together, would sooner or later raise up a very Frankenstein to judge us. On the other hand, efforts of a herculean character have been made by the landed classes to retain their old position, and induce the lower classes beneath them to accept the paternal form of government of old, and thus stave off indefinitely all projects of reform. Attempts to evade the points at issue, to misstate the arguments of political opponents by covering them with contumely and reproach as revolutionists and republicans, can scarcely much longer be of avail save it be to increase the difficulty, were such attempts unfortunately for a time to be successful. The classes of the electorate who to-day support the Conservative party will melt away from their allegiance in a period of critical excitement, as the mountain snows before a tropical sun, if once the fiery cross of the demagogue and the ominous thunder of the proletariat manifest themselves. An impotent wail will arise from the upper class at injustice, such as we hear to-day in Ireland. Violent denunciation of moderate statesmen who have vainly laboured for a solution will have done its work, until nothing be left to temper the wind to the shorn lamb, save it be an 'orderly transference of property from one class to the other.'¹

Such is the prophecy far-seeing statesmen have made regarding the future of the landowning classes of this country, unless our system of land laws is profoundly modified. It would, therefore, appear that an attentive consideration of some features of the problem would not be out of place at the present time.

The titles to property in land are very different in England to what they are in Ireland. In a few pages of the January number of the *Nineteenth Century*, Mr. Seeböhm has traced in a most able manner the originating cause of the grievance which has so long existed between the Irish landlord and the cultivator. The dispute is virtually one of 'title to the soil,' and the tenant persistently claims to be reinstated in the position which able statesmen like Sir J. Davis, who was Attorney-General in James I.'s reign, and

¹ The National Assembly in France, on the motion of the Vicomte de Noailles, abolished the feudal exemption of the nobility from taxes in 1789, and on the memorable August 4, 1789, the Duc d'Aguillon said in the National Assembly: 'Who does not groan over the scenes of horror which France at this moment exhibits? The effervescence of the people who have conquered freedom when guilty ministers thought to ravish it from them, has now become an obstacle to freedom at a time when the views of the Government are again in harmony with the wishes of the nation. It is not only the brigands who, with arms in their hands, wish to enrich themselves in the midst of public calamities, in many provinces the entire mass of the peasantry have formed themselves into a league to destroy the châteaux, ravage the lands, and above all, get possession of the charter chests where the feudal titles are deposited. They seek to shake off a yoke which for centuries has weighed on them; and we must admit that though that insurrection was culpable (what violent aggression is not so?) yet it finds much excuse in the vexations which had produced it.' We might even fancy an Irish peer delivering this speech in the Irish Parliament, did it still exist in the present century.

Sir W Petty, in George II.'s, recognised as being his just and infeasible right. The Irish landowner *is*, and always has been, more in the position of a 'rent-charger' towards his tenant, than an absolute owner in the sense of the English landlord.

The troubles which have so long existed in Ireland are traceable in their origin, first, to the laws which have allowed and encouraged the aggregation of colossal estates; and, secondly, to the fact that the owners of those estates have used their power for generations to endeavour to oust the tenant from his legal right, and place themselves in a position towards their tenantry similar to that which the English landlord occupies, thus depriving the cultivator of the soil of a right which he has for centuries fought for, and which, notwithstanding every war, every oppression which Ireland endured in former times, he has unceasingly continued to claim as being his just birthright and inheritance. Such is the problem that has to be solved in Ireland, and many must be the difficulties that must be overcome in dealing with it.

In England fortunately the second of these causes is absent, namely, the claims of divided ownership, yet the first is sufficient of itself to produce all the evils which we see to-day in Ireland if left to work out its natural consequences. Not only is it clear from what has been urged before that the system of *limited ownership* has tended steadily to starve the soil of England and to impoverish every class connected with this industry—*landlord, tenant-farmer, and labourer*—but we have seen that it has been injurious in its effect on family relations, it has operated to destroy independence of character in the people, to quench all spirit of enterprise in the farming class, all wish to improve their holdings, for fear of having their rent raised and a fine being placed on their industry. It has also tended to render the education of the agricultural classes notoriously backward, and to render them therefore peculiarly fitted to be led away by the fallacious teachings of modern socialism, which panders to those very faults on which an upper class have relied to keep back the condition of the people, namely, a disposition to look to the State for aid in the industrial struggle of life sooner than to personal exertions. Lastly, we have endeavoured to show that the system in England which has operated to destroy all absolute ownership in land, by holding it for ever in trust for unborn generations, in the furtherance of family pride of race, has not only destroyed the power of the limited owner to improve his estates and develop their latent resources, but has effectually driven from the land the large class of British yeomen farmers, men who cultivated their own lands, and at one period of our history formed the most valuable bulwark against the democratic propaganda of the towns in the sudden impulses of popular fickleness.²

² Men of exalted rank and birth, says Mr. Kay (*Free Trade in Land*, chap. x.),

In other countries of Europe, where the greater portion of the soil is owned and cultivated by the same class, we find the most conservative spirit. The cultivators in France who have grown rich by their own exertions (and have in every way a happier lot in life than any we can find in England), are, with all their republican selfishness, thorough-going Conservatives, and on the smallest suspicion of the rights to property being threatened by the democratic masses in the towns, they come to the poll as one man to assert their adherence to moderate principles.

In the parts of Germany too where a similar state of things prevailed, the *bauerschaft*, whose lands were so lately enfranchised by Stein and Hardenburg, form the most powerful influence which the State possesses to counteract the growing socialistic tendencies of the large towns and the subversive doctrines of Lassalle. The Channel islands also, which are part of our own dominions, afford us an instance which it would be well to study of the extraordinary prosperity an agricultural people may arrive at who, without possessing any peculiar superiority of soil or climate, have for centuries enjoyed the advantages of peasant ownership.

Mr. Thornton in the last edition of his *Plea for Peasant Proprietors* (p. 37 and following), conclusively proves the supe-

who might be excused for feeling some repugnance to a social organisation which has to a large extent been erected on the ruins of their class, have been among the most earnest champions of occupying proprietors.

M. Passy, who was a peer of France and a Membre de l'Institut under Louis Philippe, states it as his opinion 'that in the present state of agricultural knowledge and practice it is the small farm, *'la petite culture,'* which, after deducting the cost of production, yields, from a given surface and on equal conditions, the greatest nett produce; also, that this same system of cultivation, by maintaining a larger rural population, not only thereby adds to the strength of the State, but affords a better market for those commodities, the production and exchange of which stimulate the prosperity of the manufacturing districts.'

M. de Beaumont, who visited Ireland in 1835-37, states in his work entitled *L'Irlande Sociale*, that the creation of peasant proprietors is the real remedy for the evils of Ireland, and that the laws of primogeniture and entail should necessarily be repealed. 'Hasten,' he says (tome ii. p. 200), 'to render the land free to commerce; divide, subdivide the land among *'actual owners'* of it as much as you can: the only means of rousing the lower class of Irish is by overturning an aristocracy which ought to fall. The only means of reformation is to bring the land within the reach of the people; it is necessary, above all things, that the people of Ireland should become proprietors.'

M. de Savergne, who was also a Membre de l'Institut, says, writing in 1869: 'The best cultivation in France on the whole is that of the peasant proprietors, and the subdivision of the soil makes continual progress. Progress in both respects was indeed retarded for a succession of years after 1848 by political causes, but it has brilliantly resumed its course of late years. All round the town in which I write—Toulouse—it is a gain to profitable operation to buy land in order to resell it in small lots; and then he adds, *'the market price of land has quadrupled in ten years.'*

Lastly, speaking of the cottages of the peasant farmers, he says: 'There is nothing so delightful as the interior of these humble cottages—so clean and orderly, the very air about them breathes peace, industry, and happiness, and it is pleasing to think that they are not likely to be done away with.'

rior productiveness of small over large farms in every country of Europe, thereby disproving M'Culloch's prophecy, in 1823, that in half a century France would be the greatest 'pauper warren' in Europe. He states that the gardening farmer of Flanders is the direct progenitor of all the best improvements in crops and general agriculture which we practise to-day at home; that this style of farming has brought under cultivation successfully soils which naturally are nothing but an infertile desert, which, by means of continual attention and manure, are now made to carry stock to the extent of *one* cow to the *three* acres, thus producing in abundance that absolute necessity of all high farming, large quantities of foal-yard manure, which we too little understand in England. Also, he shows that whereas, according to Mr. Caird, $26\frac{1}{2}$ bushels is the average corn-field per acre in England, in Jersey, where the average size of farms is 16 acres, the average official return is 40 bushels; in Flanders, originally a coarse siliceous sand, 32 to 36 bushels. Of potatoes in England 10 tons an acre would be considered a good average; in Jersey we have 15 tons, and in Flanders 12 tons as the average returns. Lastly, while average land in Jersey and Guernsey lets for 4*l.* an acre, and in Switzerland the average rent is 6*l.*, by comparing the gross produce of England and the value of her food imports with her population and agricultural area, we have in England an average of *one* person per acre and a half supported by the land; in Guernsey the same calculation gives us *two* persons for every acre and a half, and in Jersey *four* persons on the same average. The population in England gives us *one* cultivator to 17 acres, in Jersey and Guernsey *one* to *four*, while the agriculture of these islands maintains a non-agricultural population respectively *twice* and *four* times as dense as that of England. And in the words of Mr. Thornton, 'this difference does not arrive from any superiority of soil or climate possessed by the Channel islands, for the former is naturally rather poor, and the latter is not better than in the southern counties of England. It is owing entirely to *'the assiduous care of the farmers and to the abundant use of manure.'*

Surely, then, we do not want evidence to show that small owners of property are a source of riches and happiness to every country that possesses them, and that the question of over-population in England is a myth when we compare the condition of agricultural England with that of our own Channel islands. It cannot be too clearly realised therefore what a discouraging influence is produced on the agricultural activity of the nation by the sweating effect these large proprietors exercise on our industry, and the huge burden they impose on the productive power of the land. The barren lands of Flanders, the rocky detritus of Switzerland, the snow-bound slopes of Norway, which latter in England and Ireland would at the best be snipe bogs or woodcock coverts, are in these countries made to produce the food and

happiness of the people. Many of the vast tracts in Scotland which have been enclosed of late years, producing nothing but a few miserable stags, would in other countries, under the magic effect of property, be, if not as Arthur Young says, 'converted from a barren waste into a garden,' any way the feeding ground for innumerable flocks of sheep, goats, and rough Highland cattle. If this be denied, let any one of the thousands of English visitors to the Engadine every summer take note of that district, where there is not a foot of waste land, the lowest part of which is not much lower than the top of Snowden.

If, therefore, we have had for so long to forego the economic advantages of small owners cultivating their own lands in England, we may fairly ask, Have the people gained social and moral improvement in their lot which have compensated for these other disadvantages? The more we consider this matter the more we shall see that all writers on this subject, all travellers who have studied the conditions of the peasantry abroad, are unanimous that not only the well-instructed peasantry of Germany and Switzerland, but the, educationally speaking, backward cultivator of France and other Roman Catholic countries, are not to be mentioned in the same breath with our labouring agricultural class in England, to say nothing of Ireland.

Yet it was not always so. In the reign of Henry IV., when England possessed a large race of cultivating owners, we have continual sumptuary laws enacted regarding the English yeomen. Little by little, however, we can trace the change; statutory tenancies or holdings in copyhold were gradually absorbed into demesnes, large grass farms were made, and pauperism made its appearance even before the suppression of the monasteries, which many writers have considered as being the cause of distress.³ The fact was that from Henry VIII. onwards the breaking up of the monastic orders threw an immense amount of property into the hands of the Crown, who, unable to retain it as a whole, granted it to the great nobles in gifts for services to the Crown, and thus were evolved the nuclei of those colossal estates many of which remain to the present day in the hands of our old families in England.

It is not difficult to see the encouragement which was thus given to the nobles to absorb the properties of the small owners of land; the progressive acts regarding pauperism in the reign of Elizabeth, which culminate in the establishment of our poor law (43 Elizabeth, c. 2), are a silent proof of what was going on. Slowly and by degrees a fine yeoman peasantry gradually became absorbed by the great territorial owners, who relet the land to the former freeholders on leases for lives, or on yearly agreement. From this moment the moral and social degradation of the people began, their independence was lost, and they gradually fell under the domination of that triumvirate,

³ Lord Bacon's *History of Henry VII.*, vol. v. p. 61. Quoted by Thornton.

the peer, the squire, and the clergy, who have so long exercised that form of paternal government which we alluded to in a former article.

The system by which this transfer was effected is graphically suggested in Massinger's *Sir Giles Overreach*, quoted by Mr. Thornton :

I'll buy some cottage near his manor,
Which done, I'll make my men break ope his fences,
Ride o'er his standing corn, or in the night
Set fire to his barns, or break his cattle's legs.
These trespasses will draw on suits, and suits expenses,
Which I can spare, but will soon beggar him.
When I have harried him thus two or three years,
Though he sue in *forma pauperis*, in spite
Of all his thrift and care he'll grow behind hand.
Then, with the favour of my man at law,
I will pretend some title: want will force him
To put it to arbitrament; then if he sells
For half the value, he shall have ready money
And I possess his land.' ²

The foregoing affords us a valuable picture of the manner in which 'Boycotting' was probably carried out in the sixteenth century.

We are too often in the present day accustomed to find in England, even among the better class of tenant farmers, a grumbling spirit of hopelessness at the existing state of things, while among the labourers, whose lives are little better than those of the original serf population of Europe, we find a complete absence of the spirit of independence and self-respect, which manifests itself in the general pauperism of the people, in their small care for their home comforts, and in their utter improvidence regarding marriage and future provisions for family or old age. In truth has it been said that in France no sooner has a child come into the world than its parents set to work to save for its future; the cultivating owner of France and other countries feels that he has a stake in the country, a position of independence to maintain; there is a recognised 'standard of comfort' among his class of which he is as proud and as little willing to forego as the highest noble in England. Family life is far more developed abroad than in England; self-respect binds together each member of the social unit, and instead of a perpetual subdivision of property in land taking place, Mr. Thornton ably shows that for the last 200 years in the Channel Islands the size of properties has not diminished; while in France and Germany not only does property act as a wise deterrent to too early marriages, but it encourages the people to seek abroad, and in emigration, an avenue to wealth where subdivision of the family estate would produce the pauperism of its various members. Lastly, not only is a country possessed largely by cultivating owners capable of supporting a larger agricultural and non-agricultural population, but the condition of the agricultural population, as to social happiness and

² *New Way to Pay Old Debts.*

moral well-being, varies directly with the growth or diminution of the great landed properties cultivated by tenants either holding by lease or from year to year.

If we want an experimental illustration of this assertion, truly Ireland affords us a significant example. Here we have a fertile soil, an equable climate, and a Celtic people, similar in many ways in character to the French, yet what a contrast ! It would not be untrue to say that the present condition of a Papuan savage is a less disgrace to humanity than the social and moral condition of the Irish are to the United Kingdom. Foolish or purposely disingenuous people seek for a reason of this state of things in the character of the Irish people ; yet a moment's consideration, not to say an hour's study, would convince them that the causes of this wholespread degradation of an entire people, who naturally possess some of the noblest qualities, and who individually have given to England some of her greatest men, is solely and entirely to be attributed to the perverse obstinacy which has insisted on perpetuating in Ireland these abominable feudal land laws.⁴

It may be said that the various arguments here stated are by no means new ; that while the rosy side of small properties is dwelt upon, the darker side of the picture is purposely excluded from observation ; and that moreover, whatever may have been the success which the peasant proprietary system has met with on the Continent, the uncertainty of our seasons and qualified fertility of our soil would reduce a class of occupying owners to starvation and bankruptcy in a short period of time. Arguing thus, it is further asserted that a class of landowning capitalists is the only system which can succeed in England, and that tenants under good landlords are infinitely better off than small owners, who, experience has shown, have universally succumbed before improved modern methods of agriculture.

In the first place it must be remembered that the landowners of this country are probably the poorest class in many ways in the social community ; their estates are all universally more or less mortgaged, to what extent we cannot exactly say, as there is no compulsory registration of land charges in England ; but it would probably be a not unfair venture to assert that the large proportion of properties in England and Ireland were burdened with various charges to the extent of one-third of their gross rental. The cost of these mortgages is probably about four per cent., whereas we know that the net return on capital invested in land does not exceed two per cent. ; thus in a

⁴ It could hardly be asserted that the Irish Land Commissioners who have just issued their report are likely to sympathise with Radical or unjust views on the subject of the right of property. Yet the general agreement they come to, although expressed with different limitations, amounts to this, that the condition of Ireland requires a drastic land measure to save the people from perpetual beggary, and that the only certain method of producing peace and contentment throughout the country is to devise an efficient scheme for the creation of a class of peasant proprietors on a large scale.

property of 10,000*l.* a year, if the estate be mortgaged to half its value, which is certainly often the case, the entire income of the property is absorbed in paying the mortgages and barely keeping the permanent buildings in repair. No improvements of any sort can be carried out, and the whole of this estate, with its entire agricultural population, is forced to remain in a state of absolute stagnation, because the owner is either prevented by settlements or is unwilling to sell.

Besides, being thus crippled with an estate verging on this condition of financial insolvency, a landowner feels himself compelled, in virtue of his social position, to keep up a style of living which his real income is not capable of supporting. He spends large sums in election expenses, on general entertainments, and country sports, to say nothing of his London house, and the demands of his wife and daughters towards providing them with the luxuries of a London life. Farms have to be repaired somehow, subscriptions to local charities kept up, gardens, game, agents, horses, servants, all have to be paid for out of, whatever outward appearances may be, what becomes a very narrow margin of income. There are many instances, no doubt, where the landowner is not in this position, where his wealth is supplemented by other resources, such as mines, house property in large towns, &c., but in the great majority of cases, where the estate is a purely agricultural one, the 'tenant for life' is surrounded by all these difficulties combined.

Again, it is urged in argument based on particular instances where we see the estates of wealthy owners well managed and the people well cared for, that such a state of things is the pride and happiness of a country. It must not be forgotten, however, that all this state of apparent prosperity is entirely dependent on the '*personal character of one man*'—namely, the present owner. His son, or successor, may turn out to be a spendthrift, may go on the turf and become ruined; the whole of this vast property is then placed in the hands of trustees. Not a penny is spent in improvements, everything is saved for creditors and to obtain a small margin of income for the ruined owner, and thus perhaps for forty or fifty years, especially in the case of a minority, a property may remain like a talent buried in a napkin, the Court of Chancery and a lot of indifferent trustees and hungry lawyers in London being the sole arbiters of the welfare of entire districts inhabited by a large and struggling people, all condemned to live in quasi-pauperism because no one will spend money on their yearly holdings, while they themselves naturally dare not invest capital for which they can obtain no sort of security.

There is not a solicitor in London, or hardly a person in any way connected with landed estates, who could not name off-hand many existing instances of this state of things, yet we are asked, How are the poor to be provided for? How are churches and schools to be

built, model cottages erected, and the well-being of the people cared for if the landed gentry are swept away? No one, who is not a communist, wishes to see the landed gentry swept away, and their mansions, parks, and estates destroyed and divided up as they were in France under the operations of the *Bande Noire*. It is an advantage in every way for the well-being of the people that our wealthy classes and nobility should continue, as they have done, to pursue a country life and set the example in all improvements in husbandry, to say nothing of the beneficial influence their personal example may exert morally on their smaller neighbours; but the time has come when the people of this country should be disabused of the idea that the farmers and agricultural labourers are a mass of children who have been ordained by Providence to be dictated to, and ruled by a form of paternal administration of which we see an admirable illustration in those recent letters of the *Times*' Irish special correspondent containing his account of the best managed properties in Ireland. The curse of the present state of things is not so much the poverty of the agricultural population as the utter want of energy and independence of character which is the marked feature of their condition. Thus compare the intelligent Swiss cultivator or the French peasant with our own people. It is true we meet with none of the servility of manners and deference to superiors which the English villager has instilled into him from the days when he attends school upwards; nevertheless every traveller will admit that a more civil, well-mannered, manly, and independent race does not exist than the agricultural classes on the Continent; their hospitality and obliging behaviour to strangers is testified to by all; the neatness and comfort of their small homes has been the subject of panegyric with many writers, their frugality and care for the future of their children is a marked feature in their condition; and lastly, as we have before said, their hatred of all socialism and democratic movements against the just rights of property is notorious to all who have studied this question.

A vast danger exists in this country for our social institutions until a complete change is brought about in our land system. We have 'no great middle party of order' connected with our landed interest, we have nothing but an antiquated system of hereditary landed rulers, and a dependent peasantry; the old yeoman class has been absorbed, and there is nothing as yet to take its place. No serious thinker can view this state of things, however peaceful the appearances may be for the moment, without grave apprehensions. Various State measures affecting county management and popular representation must shortly become law, and a struggle will at once begin between conflicting interests, attended with consequences which will embitter the relationships of those three classes who are now interested in the land. The only safeguard that can be devised is to abolish without delay all protective laws such as the powers of settlement of land in

life interests, the accumulations of family charges, and the unlimited power to mortgage estates. ~~Now~~ once these laws be abolished, a natural operation will shortly begin to disintegrate vast properties; buyers will appear in plenty so soon as land transfer is simplified, and properties, instead of being thrown wholesale on the market, as they would be in revolutionary times (as we shall not improbably see in Ireland), the value of land will keep up, and eventually we shall find that instead of the price of land falling it will rise, as it has done in every country that has abolished feudalism, to double what it was under the old system.⁵

Nothing has a more injurious effect than the unlimited power of mortgaging land. It encourages persons to purchase and hold it whom the most exceptional conditions of fertility of soil and personal hard work, could alone enable to pay off the liabilities. In many ways it has operated badly both in France and Germany among the peasantry, and has driven the people into the hands of the local money-lenders. With regard to our large English estates the power of creating these secret preferential charges has had the most injurious effect, by allowing persons to retain nominally the ownership of property which to all intents and purposes has passed from their hands. It has afforded a magnificent field of operations to the great number of insurance offices, who are practically nothing more than a vast aggregation of money-lenders, whose rate of interest derived from perfect securities is considerably above the current rate. It has also proved itself a most useful tool in the hands of lawyers for

* At page 173 of Mr. Brodrick's *English Land*, he gives us a *résumé* of his own and Mr. Bateman's analyses of the Domesday returns of 1875. He divides the owners of land into eight classes. Peers, great landowners, or commoners holding properties over 3,000 acres; squires owning estates from 1,000 to 3,000 acres; greater yeomen, include estates between 300 and 1,000 acres; lesser yeomen, owning estates between 100 and 300 acres; small proprietors, including lands from 1 to 100 acres; cottagers, including all holdings under an acre; public bodies as included in the Government return of 1876.

At page 187 he gives us in a short table the summary of these returns for England and Wales.

Class	No. of Owners	Extent in Acres
Peers and Peeresses	400	5,728,979
Greater Landowners	1,288	8,497,699
Squires	2,529	4,319,271
Greater Yeomen	9,585	4,782,627
Lesser Yeomen	24,412	4,144,272
Small Proprietors	217,049	3,931,806
Cottagers	703,289	151,143
Public Bodies:—	14,459	
The Crown, Barracks, etc.		165,427
Religious and Educational.		947,655
Commercial, etc.		330,466
Waste		1,524,624
Total	973,011	34,523,974

devising intricacies of every description in the titles to land, so that not only present owners but intending purchasers are irresistibly caught in the meshes of their legal nets, and the transfer of this species of property is rendered ruinously costly and difficult.

Since then the owner of mortgaged estates derives no corresponding return for the disadvantages he suffers from, it would be no hardship to him for the State to decree, that after a certain date from the passing of the Act (say twenty-five years), all existing mortgages should cease to be legal documents if they exceeded in value more than a certain number of years' purchase of the rental (say five years). The State should moreover decree that from the date of the passing of the Act no mortgage exceeding five years' rental of any parcel of land should be executed; that every species of charge and mortgage should be registered in a public land-registry office, and that every title should within a specified time (say again twenty-five years) be registered in the aforesaid public office, of which there would be branches in all chief towns of quarter sessions; and that a number of years, which should be named in the Act (say seven, and in the case of dispute twenty-one years), should be held to be sufficient to prove a title, public notice to be given for twelve months previous to registry, in order to afford opportunity for any dispute regarding the title to be brought up for trial. The expense to owners of land in thus registering their titles would not be very large if time was thus given for the operation to take place gradually.

A second Act would also be required to deal with the question of testamentary dispositions and entail. This Act should first provide for the establishment of a public trustee office for the purpose of registering all trusts, with head quarters in London, Edinburgh, and Dublin. Such a court might be a development of the present Court of Chancery. Secondly, the power to make a life interest of any sort should be abolished, except as regards the houses, parks, and pleasure domains of land owners, or of residential house property in towns. These it might still be permitted to an owner to settle in trust for an eldest son, or whoever else the owner chooses; the power of resettlement of these residential domains should be abolished except where the contract is intended to form part of a marriage settlement: *i.e.* an arrangement must be made *inter vivos*, and no settlement made by will shall be legal. All charges for jointure, younger children's portions, and mortgages of every description beyond the life of the testator, shall be illegal, the executors of a will being only empowered to hold land for sale to the best advantage, to fulfil the money provision of a testament. Personal and real estate will thus be merged under the same legal provision, and in case the owner die without making a will, the whole property shall be divided in equal shares among his children, or in default of children, in graduating proportions among his rela

tions. A testator should be given full liberty to bequeath his property absolutely to whomsoever he chooses, no provisoes as to marriage or other limiting clauses to be considered good in law. A limit should, however, be placed on the power of any individual to exclude his wife or any of his children from a share of his property, and taking the Scotch law regarding personalty as a basis, one-half should be set aside as the '*inalienable portion*' of the younger children and widow or widower, the portion of the latter to be permitted to be controlled by whatsoever limitation the testator chooses to insert in his testament.⁶

Such, in a few words, are the lines which might be adopted for creating an Act to regulate the land laws of England; a companion Act dealing with the powers of testamentary disposition is absolutely necessary to give any completeness to a scheme for obviating the evils which now exist. The hitherto sacred character of testamentary provisions has worked incalculable evil, both directly and indirectly, to the land; yet it would be manifestly unjust to curtail the powers of landowners without at the same time dealing with the right of bequeathal generally to every other species of property.

Thus we should insure the just and fair authority of the father over the children, and at the same time control the father from acts of injustice and overbearing conduct towards those who are more or less necessarily dependant on him for their future, and who were brought into the world by his desire.

That the passing of such laws as this would operate an immense change in the disposition of landed property in the period of one generation cannot be denied, yet the evil consequences which have resulted from the long continuance of old laws are not to be eradicated by less heroic means, neither would such measures as are here sketched out perpetrate acts of injustice or expropriation on present holders of property. The State has a right to define the powers of

⁶ Mr. Brodrick, in his able work on the English land, when discussing the evils of limited ownership, says, p. 347, 'that the abolition of life estates in land is, therefore, perfectly consistent with the maintenance or toleration of life interests in personalty, if public opinion is not yet ripe for a radical alteration in the form of ordinary marriage settlements. It is also perfectly consistent with the practice of vesting a family property whole and undivided in the eldest son, and charging it for the benefit of a widow and younger children. It would even be consistent with the practice of directing a property to be sold and settling the proceeds as personalty, yet allowing the sale to be postponed so long as the parties interested should be willing to accept interest out of the undivided property in lieu of capital sums out of the proceeds.'—Certain advantages might be gained in such a family arrangement as is here described, as it would enable the influence of the whole family to exert itself much as it does under the French *conseil de famille* which is recognised as a social institution in the Code. An insuperable objection, however, exists to the plan Mr. Brodrick recommends of allowing a testator the full powers of bequeathal over his property of all sorts; and as a confirmation of this we need only refer to the case of *Wilson v. Birchall*, as reported in the papers of February 16, 1881, by which it will be seen that a testator left the whole of his wife's fortune of 40,000*l.* which she inherited from her father, to his mistress and his two illegitimate children.

testamentary disposition which should be allowed to the individual, and it cannot be said that if a fair time be given for the working out of such measures, the value of landed property would be diminished. Sales would undoubtedly become more frequent, especially of small portions of land; owners would be tempted to break up out-lying estates and put them up to sale 'in small lots,' after having registered the title and cleared the charges thereon. Plenty of buyers would turn up immediately the various difficulties of title and expenses of transfer were got rid of, the various building and land societies in the country are even now, under the present involved state of our land laws, working in this direction, and we can readily conceive the impetus which would be given for further developing these useful projects.

Labourers would soon become the owners of gardens and cottages. Farmers would often purchase their farms outright. A stimulus to save would be created throughout the whole nation, when everyone could look forward to purchase a house and a small freehold from out of their savings.

Can anyone (even the most outrageous Conservative) deny that the re-establishment of a yeoman class of labourers or farmers would be other than an inestimable boon to this country, and would eventually raise up a class who, instead of being antagonistic to the rights of property, will be among its staunchest defenders. Surely we have in the state of political thought on the Continent enough to warn us that we require in this country to throw up a popular rampart against the growing fallacies of Communism. Is Nihilism, Socialism, and Internationalism to be the creed of the labouring classes on the Continent only, and are we to be for ever free from this fatal political disease? If so, these objects must be secured, and we cannot too early set to work to inaugurate just laws encouraging the greater division of property in land, and thus arm the whole nation against these subversive hordes from the larger towns and restless centres of industry. Can it be supposed otherwise that in the day of trouble arguments and lengthy speeches on political economy will be of any avail. The Tory party, who are rampant to-day at the very thought of the curtailment of the right of the landowners in Ireland, seem not to be able to see the consequences which would result were they successful in their opposition. It is impossible, however, in Ireland, as also it is in England, for one class for ever to monopolise every rational source of happiness in a country, and to place up notice boards to warn off trespassers along every avenue of enterprise, except the one long high road of daily drudgery and labour, or the demoralising bypath of drunkenness, poverty, and crime.

BLANDFORD.

JULES JACQUEMART.

THERE died, last September, at his mother's house in the great high road between the Arc de Triomphe and the Bois, a unique artist whose death was for the most part unobserved by the frequenters of picture galleries. He had contributed but little to picture galleries. There had not been given to Jules Jacquemart the pleasure of a very wide notoriety, but in many ways he was happy—in many fortunate. He was fortunate, to begin with, in his birth; for though he was born in the *bourgeoisie*, it was in the cultivated *bourgeoisie*, and it was in the *bourgeoisie* of France. His father, Albert Jacquemart, the known historian of pottery and porcelain, and of ancient and fine furniture, was of course a diligent amateur of beautiful things, so that Jules Jacquemart was reared in a house where little was ugly, and much was exceedingly precious; a house organised, albeit unconsciously, on William Morris's admirable plan, 'Have nothing in your home that you do not know to be useful or believe to be beautiful.' Thus his own natural sensitiveness, which he had inherited, was highly cultivated from the first. From the first he breathed the air of Art. He was happy in the fact that adequate fortune gave him the liberty, in health, of choosing his work, and in sickness, of taking his rest. With comparatively rare exceptions, he did precisely the things which he was fitted to do, and did them perfectly, and being ill when he had done them, he betook himself to the exquisite South, where colour is, and light—the things we long for the most when we are most tired in cities—and so there came to him towards the end a surprise of pleasure in so beautiful a world. He was happy in being surrounded all his life long by passionate affection in the narrow circle of his home. His mother survives him—the experience of bereavement being hers, when it would naturally have been his. For himself, he was happier than she, for he had never suffered any quite irreparable loss. And in one other way he was probably happy—in that he died in middle age, his work being entirely done. The years of deterioration and of decay, in which first the artist does but dully reproduce the spontaneous work of his youth, and then is sterile altogether—the years in which he is no longer the fashion at all, but only the landmark or the finger-post of

a fashion that is past—the years when a name once familiar is uttered at rare intervals and in tones of apology as the name of one whose performance has never quite equalled the promise he had aforetime given—these years never came to Jules Jacquemart. He was spared these years.

But few people care, or are likely to care very much, for the things which chiefly interested him, and which he reproduced in his art; and even the care for these things, where it does exist, does unfortunately by no means imply the power to appreciate the art by which they are retained and diffused. ‘Still-life,’ using the awkward expression in its broadest sense—the portrayal of objects, natural or artificial, for the objects’ sake, and not as background or accessory—has never been rated very highly or very widely loved. Here and there a professed connoisseur has had pleasure from some piece of exquisite workmanship; a rich man has looked with idly caressing eye upon the skilful record of his gold plate or the grapes of his forcing-house. There has been praise for the adroit Dutchmen, and for Lance, and Blaise Desgoffe. But the public generally—save perhaps in the case of William Hunt, his birds’ nests and primroses—has been indifferent to these things, and often the public has been right in its indifference, for often these things are done in a poor spirit, a spirit of servile imitation, or servile flattery, with which Art has nothing to do. But there are exceptions, and there is a better way of looking at these things. William Hunt was often one of these exceptions; Chardin was always—save in a rare instance or so of dull pomposity of rendering; Jules Jacquemart, take him for all in all, was of these exceptions the most brilliant and the most peculiar. He, in his best art of etching, and his fellows and forerunners in the art of painting, have done something to endow the beholders of their work with a new sense, with the capacity for new experiences of enjoyment—they have portrayed not so much matter as the very soul of matter. They have put matter in its finest light: it has got new dignity. Chardin did this with his peaches, his pears, his big coarse bottles, his rough copper saucepans, his silk-lined caskets. Jacquemart did it—we shall see in more of detail presently—very specially with the finer work of artistic men in household matter and ornament; with his blue and white porcelain, with his polished steel of chased armour and sword-blade, with his Renaissance mirrors, with his precious vessels of crystal and jade and jasper. But when he was most fully himself, his work most characteristic and individual, he shut himself off from popularity. Even untrained observers could accept the agile engraver as an interpreter of other men’s pictures—of Meissonier’s inventions, or Van der Meer’s, or Greuze’s—but they could not accept him as the interpreter at first hand of the treasures which were so peculiarly his own that he may almost be said to have discovered them and their beauty. They were not alive to the

wonders that have been done in the world by the hands of artistic men. How could they be alive to the wonders of this their reproduction—their translation, rather, and a very free and personal one—into the subtle lines, the graduated darks, the soft or sparkling lights, of the artist in etching?

On September 7, 1837, Jacquemart was born, in Paris, and the profession of art, in one or other of its branches, came naturally to a man of his race. A short period of practice in draughtmanship, and only a small experience of the particular business of etching, sufficed to make him a master. As time proceeded, he of course developed; he found new methods—ways not previously known to him. But little of what is obviously tentative and immature is to be noticed even in his earliest work. He springs into his art an artist fully armed, like Rembrandt with the wonderful portrait of his mother ‘lightly etched.’ In 1860, when he is but twenty-three, he is at work upon the illustrations to his father’s *Histoire de la Porcelaine*, and though in that publication the absolute realisation of wonderful matter is not perhaps so noteworthy as in the *Gemmes et Joyaux de la Couronne*, there is evident already the hand of the delicate artist and the eye that can appreciate and render almost unconsidered beauties. Exquisite matter and the forms that art has given to common things have found their new interpreter. The *Histoire de la Porcelaine* contains twenty-six plates, most of which are devoted to Oriental china, of which the elder Jacquemart possessed a magnificent collection at a time when the popular rage for ‘blue and white’ was still unpronounced. Many of Albert Jacquemart’s pieces figure in the book; they were pieces the son had lived with and which he knew familiarly. Their charm, their delicacy, he perfectly represented, and of each individual piece he appreciated the characteristics, passing too, without sense of difficulty, from the bizarre ornamentation of the East to the ordered forms and satisfying symmetry which the high taste of the Renaissance gave to its products. Thus, in the *Histoire de la Porcelaine*—amongst the quaintly naturalistic decorations from China (pieces whose beauties Mr. Lang might chaffingly sing about as made to perfection ‘in the reign of the Emperor Hwang’), and amongst the ornaments of Sèvres, with their pretty boudoir graces and airs of light luxury fit for the Marquise of Louis Quinze and the sleek young abbé her pet and her counsellor, we find, rendered with just as thorough an appreciation, a *Brocca Italienne*, the Brocca of the Medici, of the sixteenth century, slight and tall, where the lightest of Renaissance forms, the thin and reed-like lines of the *arabesque*—no mass or splash of colour—is patterned with measured exactitude, with rhythmic completeness, over the smoothish surface. It is wonderful how little work there is in the etching and how much is suggested. The actual touches are almost as few as those which Jacquemart

employed afterwards in some of his light effects of rock-crystal, the material which he has interpreted perhaps best of all. One counts the touches, and one sees how soon and how strangely he has got the power of suggesting all that he does not actually give, of suggesting all that is in the object by the little that is in the etching. On such work may be bestowed, amongst much other praise, that particular praise which, to fashionable French criticism, delighted especially with the feats of adroitness, and occupied with the evidence of the artist's dexterity, seems the highest—*Il n'y a rien, et il y a tout*.

Execution so brilliant can hardly also be faultless, and without mentioning many instances among his earlier work, where the defect is chiefly noticeable, it may be said that the roundness of round objects is more than once missing in his etchings. Strange that the very quality first taught to and first acquired by the most ordinary pupil of a Government School of Art should have been wanting to an artist often as adroit in his methods as he was individual in his vision! The *Vase de Vieux Vincennes*, from the collection of M. Léopold Double, is a case to the point. It has the variety of tone, the seeming fragility of texture and ornament, the infinity of decoration, the rendering of the subtle curvature of a flower, and of the transparency of the wing of a passing insect. It has everything but the roundness—everything but the quality that is the easiest and the most common. But so curious a deficiency, occasionally displayed, could not weigh against the amazing evidence of various cleverness, and Jacquemart was shortly engaged by the publishers and engaged by the French Government.

The difference in the commissions accorded by those two—the intelligent service which the one was able to render to the nation in the act of setting the artist about his appropriate work, and, broadly speaking, the hindrance which the other opposed to his individual development—could nowhere go unnoticed, and least of all could go unnoticed in a land like ours, too full of a dull pride in *laissez-faire*, in private enterprise, in Government inaction. To the initiative of the Imperial Government, as Mr. Hamerton well pointed out when he was appreciating Jacquemart as long as twelve years ago, was due the undertaking by the artist of the colossal task, by the fulfilment of which he secured his fame. Moreover, if the Imperial Government had not been there to do this thing, this thing would never have been done, and some of the noblest and most intricate objects of art in the possession of the State would have gone unrecorded—their beauty unknown and undiffused. Even as it is, though the task definitely commissioned was brought to its proper end, a desirable sequel that had been planned remained untouched. The hand that recorded the ordered grace of Renaissance ornament would have shown as well as any the intentions of more modern craftsmen—the decoration of the Eighteenth Century in France, with its light and luxurious elegance.

The *Histoire de la Porcelaine*, then—begun in 1860, published by Techener in 1862—was followed in 1864 by the *Gemmes et Joyaux de la Couronne*. The Chalcographie of the Louvre—the department which concerns itself with the issue of commissioned prints—took the publication of the *Gemmes et Joyaux*. In the series there were sixty subjects, or at least sixty plates, for sometimes Jacquemart, seated by his window in the Louvre (which is reflected over and over again at every angle in the lustre of the objects he designed), would etch in one plate the portraits of two treasures, glad to give ‘value’ to the virtues of the one by juxtaposition with the virtues of the other: to oppose, say, the brilliant transparency of the rock-crystal ball to the texture, sombre and velvety, of the vase of ancient sardonyx. Of all these plates M. Louis Gonse has given an accurate account, sufficiently detailed for most people’s purposes, in the *Gazette des Beaux-Arts* for 1876. The catalogue of Jacquemart’s etchings there contained was a work of industry and of very genuine interest on M. Gonse’s part, and its necessary extent, due to the artist’s own prodigious diligence in work, sufficiently excuses, for the time at least, an occasional incompleteness of description, making absolute identification sometimes a difficult matter. The critical appreciation was warm and intelligent, and the student of Jacquemart must always be indebted to Gonse. But for the quite adequate description of work like Jacquemart’s, there was needed not only the French tongue—the tongue of criticism—but a Gautier to use it. Only a critic whose intelligence gave form and definiteness to the impressions of senses preternaturally acute, could have given quite adequate expression to Jacquemart’s dealing with beautiful matter—to his easy revelry of colour and light over lines and contours of selected beauty. Everything that Jacquemart could do in the rendering of beautiful matter, and of its artistic and appropriate ornament, is represented in one or other of the varied subjects of the *Gemmes et Joyaux*, save only his work with delicate china. And the work represents his strength, and hardly ever betrays his weakness. He was never a thoroughly trained academical draughtsman: a large and detailed treatment of the nude figure—any further treatment of it than that required for the beautiful suggestion of it as it occurs on Renaissance mirror-frames or in Renaissance porcelains—would have found him deficient. He had a wonderful feeling for the unbroken flow of its line, for its suppleness, for the figure’s harmonious movement. He was not the master of its most intricate anatomy; but, on the scale on which he had to treat it, his suggestion was faultless. By the brief shorthand of his art in this matter, we are brought back to the old formula of praise. Here indeed, if anywhere, *il n’y a rien, et il y a tout*.

And as nothing in his etchings is more adroit than his treatment of the figure, so nothing is more delightful, and, as it were, unex-

pected. He feels the intricate unity of its curve and flow—how it gives value by its happy accidents of line to the fixed and invariable ornament of Renaissance decoration: an ornament as orderly as well-observed verse, with its settled form, its repetition, its refrain. I will mention two or three instances which seem the most notable. One of them occurs in the drawing of a Renaissance mirror—*Miroir Français du Seizième Siècle*—elaborately carved, but its chief grace, after all, is its fine proportions—not so much in the perfection of the ornament as in the perfect disposition of it. The absolutely satisfactory filling of a given space with the enrichments of design, the occupation of the space without the crowding of it—for that is what is meant by the perfect disposition of ornament—has always been the problem for the decorative artist. Recent fashion has insisted, quite sufficiently, that it has been best solved by the Japanese; and they indeed have solved it, and sometimes with a singular economy of means, suggesting rather than achieving the occupation of the space they have worked upon. But the best Renaissance design has solved the problem quite as well, in fashions less arbitrary, with rhythm more pronounced and yet more subtle, with a precision more exquisite, with a complete comprehension of the value of quietude, of the importance of rest. If it requires ‘an Athenian tribunal’ to understand Ingres and Flaxman, it needs at all events some education in beautiful line to understand the art of Renaissance ornament. Such art Jacquemart of course understood absolutely, and against its ordered lines the free play of the nude figure is indicated with touches dainty, faultless, and few. Thus it is, I say, in the *Miroir Français du Seizième Siècle*. And to the attraction of the figure has been added almost the attraction of landscape and landscape atmosphere in the plate No. 27 of the *Gemmes et Joyaux*, representing scenes from Ovid, as an artist of the Renaissance had portrayed them on the delicate liquid surface of *crystal de roche*. And, not confining our examination wholly to the *Gemmes et Joyaux*—of which obviously the mirror just spoken of cannot form a part—we observe there or elsewhere in Jacquemart’s work how his treatment of the figure takes constant note of the material in which the first artist, his original, was working. Is it raised porcelain, for instance, or soft ivory, or smooth cold bronze, with its less close and subtle following of the figure’s curves, its certain measure of angularity in limb and trunk, its many facets, with somewhat marked transition from one to the other (instead of the unbroken harmony of the real figure), its occasional flatnesses? If it is this, this is what Jacquemart gives us in his etchings—not the figure only, but the figure as it comes to us through the medium of bronze. See, for instance, the *Vénus Marine*, lying half extended, with slender legs; long a possession of Monsieur Thiers, I believe. You cannot insist too much on Jacquemart’s mastery over his material—*cloisonné*, with its many low tones, its delicate patterning outlined by metal ribs; the coarse-

ness of rough wood, as in the *Salière de Troyes*; the sharp clear sword-blade, as the sword of François Premier, the signet's flatness and delicate smoothness—'C'est le vinet du Roy Saint Louis'—and the red porphyry, flaked, as it were, and speckled, of an ancient vase, and the clear soft unctuous green of jade.

And as the material is marvellously varied, so are its combinations curious and wayward. I saw last autumn, at Lyons, their sombre little church of Ainay, a Christian edifice built of no Gothic stones, but placed, already ages ago, on the site of a Roman Temple—the Temple used, its dark columns cut across, its black stones rearranged, and so the church completed—Antiquity pressed into the service of the Middle Age. Jacquemart, dealing with the precious objects he had to portray, came often upon such strange meetings: an antique vase of sardonyx, say, infinitely precious, mounted and altered in the twelfth century for the service of the Mass, and so, beset with gold and jewels, offered by its possessor to the Abbey of Saint Denis.

It was not a literal imitation, it must be said again, that Jacquemart made of these things. These things sat to him for their portraits; he posed them; he composed them aright. Placed by him in their best lights, they revealed their finest qualities. He loved an effective contrast of them, a comely juxtaposition; a legitimate accessory he could not neglect—that window, by which he sat as he worked, flashed its light upon a surface that caught its reflection; in so many different ways the simple expedient helps the task, gives the object roundness, betrays its lustre. Some people bore hardly on him for the colour, warmth, and life he introduced into his etchings. They wanted a colder, a more impersonal, a more precise record. Jacquemart never sacrificed precision when precision was of the essence of the business, but he did not care for it for its own sake. And the thing that his first critics blamed him for doing—the composition of his subject, the rejection of this, the choice of that, the bestowal of fire and life upon matter dead to the common eye—is a thing which artists in all arts have always done, and will always continue to do, and for this most simple reason, that the doing of it is Art.

Not very long after the *Gemmes et Joyaux* was issued as we now have it, the life of Frenchmen was upset by the war. Schemes of work waited or were abandoned; at last men began as a distinguished Frenchman at that time wrote to me, 'to rebuild their existence out of the ruins of the Past.' In 1873, Jacquemart, for his part, was at work again on his own best work of etching. The *Histoire de la Céramique*, a companion to the *Histoire de la Porcelaine*, was in that year published. To an earlier period (to 1868) belong the two exquisite plates of the light porcelain of Valenciennes, executed for Dr. Le Jeal's monograph on the history of that fabric. And to 1866 belongs an etching already familiarly known to the readers of the *Gazette des*

Beaux-Arts and to possessors of the first edition of *Etchers and Etching*—the Tripod—a priceless thing of jasper, set in golden carvings, by Gouthière, and now lodged among the best treasures of the great house in Manchester Square.

But it is useless to continue further the chronicle of the triumphs that Jacquemart won in the translation, in his own free fashion of black and white, of all sorts of beautiful matter. Moreover in 1873, the year of the issue of his last important series of plates, Jules Jacquemart, stationed at Vienna, as one of the jury of the International Exhibition there, caught a serious illness—a fever of the typhoid kind—and this left him a delicacy which he could never overcome. Thenceforth his work was limited. Where it was not a weariness, it had to be little but a recreation—a comparative pause. That was the origin of his performances in water-colour, undertaken in the South, whither he repaired at each approach of winter. There remains, then, only to speak of these drawings and of such of his etched work as consisted in the popularisation of painted pictures. As a copyist of famous canvasses he found remunerative and sometimes fame-producing labour.

As an interpreter of other men's pictures, it fell to the lot of Jacquemart, as it generally falls to the lot of professional engravers, to engrave the most different masters. But with so very personal an artist as he, the interpretation of so many men, and in so many years, from 1860, or thereabouts, onwards, could not possibly be always of equal value. Once or twice he was very strong in the reproduction of the Dutch portrait-painters; but as far as Dutch painting is concerned, he is strongest of all when he interprets, as in one now celebrated etching, Jan van der Meer of Delft. *Der Soldat und das lachende Mädchen* was when Jacquemart etched it what it still remains—one of the most noteworthy pieces in the rich cabinet of M. Léopold Double. The big and somewhat blustering trooper common in Dutch art, sits here engaging the attention of that pointed-faced, subtle, but vivacious maiden peculiar to Van der Meer. Behind the two, who are occupied in contented gazing and contented talk, is the bare sunlit wall, spread only with its map or chart—the Dutchman made his wall as instructive as Joseph Surface made his screen—and by the side of the couple, throwing its brilliant, yet modulated light on the woman's face and on the background, is the intricately patterned window, the airy lattice. Rarely was a master's subject or a master's method better interpreted than in this print. Frans Hals once or twice is just as characteristically rendered. But with these exceptions it is Jacquemart's own fellow-countrymen whom he renders the best. Seldom was finish so free from pettiness or the evidence of effort as it is in the *Défilé des populations lorraines devant l'Impératrice à Nancy*. *Le Liseur* is even finer—Meissonier again; this time a solitary figure, with bright, soft light from window at the side, as in

the Van der Meer of Delft. The suppleness of Jacquemart's talent—the happy speed of it, rather than its patient elaboration—is shown by his renderings of Greuze, the *Rêve d'amour*, a single head, and *L'Orage*, a sketchy picture of a young and frightened mother kneeling by her child exposed to the storm. Greuze, with his cajoling art—which if one likes, one must like without respecting—is entirely there. So, too, Fragonard, the whole ardent and voluptuous soul of him, in *Le Premier Baiser*. Labour it is possible to give in much greater abundance; but intelligence in interpretation cannot go any further or do anything more.

Between the etchings of Jacquemart and his water-colour drawings there is little affinity. The subjects of the one hardly ever recall the subjects of the other. The etchings and the water-colours have but one thing in common—an extraordinary lightness of hand. Once, however, the theme is the same. Jacquemart etched some compositions of flowers; Monsieur Gonse has praised them very highly: to me, elegant as they are, fragile of substance and dainty of arrangement, they seem inferior to that last-century flower-piece which we English are fortunate enough to know through the exquisite mezzotint of Earlom. But in the occasional water-colour painting of flowers—especially in the decorative disposition of them over a surface for ornament—Jacquemart is not easily surpassed; the lightness and suggestiveness of the work are almost equal to Fantin's. A painted fan by Jacquemart, which is retained by M. Petit, the dealer, is dexterous, yet simple in the highest degree; the theme is a bough of the apple-tree, where the blossom is pink, white, whiter, then whitest against the air at the branch's end.

But generally his water-colour is of landscape; a record of the South. Perhaps it is the sunlit and flower-bearing coast, his own refuge in winter weather. Perhaps, as in a drawing of Monsieur May's, it is the mountains behind Mentone—their conformation, colours and tones, and their thin wreaths of mist—a drawing which Monsieur May, himself an habitual mountaineer in those regions, assures me is of the most absolute truth. Or, perhaps, as in another drawing in the same collection, it is a view of *Marseilles*; sketchy at first sight, yet with nothing unachieved that might have helped the effect; not the Marseilles, sunny and brilliant, parched and southern, of most men's observation—the Marseilles even of the great observer, the Marseilles of *Little Dorrit*—but the busy port, with its ever-shifting life, under an effect less *banal*, less *connu*; the Marseilles of an overcast morning: all its houses, all its shipping, all its quays, grey, and green, and steel-coloured, in infinite variety. Such a work is a masterpiece, with the great quality of a masterpiece, that you cannot quickly exhaust the restrained wealth of its learned simplicity. To speak about it one technical word, we may say that while it belongs by its frank sketchiness to the earlier

order of water-colour art, an art of rapid effect as practised best by Dewint and David Cox, it belongs to the later order—to contemporary art—by its unhesitating employment of body colour.

The true source of the diversity of Jacquemart's efforts, which I have now made apparent, is perhaps to be found in the vivacity of his Intellect, in his continual alertness to all passing impressions. These alone make a variety of interests easy and even necessary. They push men to express themselves in art of every kind; they push men to be collectors as well as artists, to possess as well as to create. Jacquemart inherited the passion of a collector; it was a queer thing that he set himself to collect. He was a collector of shoe leather; foot-gear of every sort and of every time. His father, Albert Jacquemart, had said that to know the pottery of a nation was to know its history. Jules saw many histories, of life and travel, and the aims of travel, in the curious objects of his collection. Their ugliness—what would be to most of us the extreme distastefulness of them—did not repel him. Nor were his attentions devoted chiefly to the dainty slippers of a dancer—souvenirs, at all events, of the art of the ballet, very saleable at fancy fairs of the theatrical profession. Nor do we owe to him, as to Jules de Goncourt, a young girl's relics, the *Pantoufles de Mademoiselle Marcille*. He etched his own boots, tumbled out of the house's worst cupboard. He looked at them with affection—*souvenirs de voyage*. The harmless eccentricity brings down, for a moment, to very ordinary levels, this watchful and exquisite artist, so devoted generally to high beauty, so keen to see it.

What more would he have done had the forty-three years been greatly prolonged, a spell of life for further work accorded, Hezekiah-like, to a busy labourer upon whom Death had laid its first warning hand? We cannot answer the question, but it must have been much, so variously active was his talent, so fertile his resource. As it is, what may he hope to live by, now that the most invariably fatal of all forms of consumption, the most fatal and the least suspected, *la phthisie laryngée*, has arrested his effort? A very gifted, a singularly agile and supple translator of painter's work, he may surely be allowed to be—and a water-colour artist, perfectly individual, yet hardly actually great; his strange dexterity of hand at the service of fact, not at the service of imagination. He recorded Nature; he did not exalt or interpret it. He interpreted Art. He was alive, more than any one has been alive before, to all the wonders that have been wrought in the world by the hands of artistic men.

FREDERICK WEDMORE.

REBECCAISM.

IN these days of the Irish Land League, it is curious to turn to the Welsh Anti-Salmon League, now making itself disagreeably felt in a portion of South Wales where flow the Wye and its tributaries.

About half a century back a small band of Welsh dissenters, in their fondness for Bible quotations, chose their name from Genesis xxiv. 60, where, speaking of Rebecca, it is said, 'Be thou the mother of thousands of millions, and let thy seed possess the gate of those who hate them.'

Thus a secret society of 'Rebeccaites' was formed for redressing in their own fashion the grievances that then existed in the excessive number of turnpike gates throughout South Wales.

About that time, and shortly before the introduction of railways, the magistrates in these districts had set themselves to make new roads, as well as to widen and improve the gradients of the old ones, and to pay the cost of this they had increased the turnpike gates so much, that there was not a small town or scarcely a village that was not approached by a gate. This multiplied the tolls so much as to cause a heavy tax upon travellers going long distances, as was often the case in those days, especially on farmers and dealers frequenting fairs, or going from Cardiganshire, Carmarthenshire, Breconshire, or Radnorshire into the midland counties. Dressed as women, sometimes armed, and riding good horses, this band made a clean sweep of such gates as they thought objectionable, tearing down the houses, throwing the gates into the rivers, and creating quite a panic in these usually quiet districts. The police were powerless, and the military were called out, but not a single 'Rebecca' could be taken. The gates were no sooner reinstated than 'Rebecca' and her daughters redemolished them. The attention of Government was called to the question, and, thanks to the able handling of the subject by the then representatives of South Wales, an Act of Parliament was passed, called 'The South Wales Turnpike Act,' which has proved an inestimable benefit to South Wales. Its chief provision is that no gate shall be erected within seven miles of another, unless they free one another. Power is given to raise money on easy terms to pay off existing debts, and a system of Government control and inspection

is adopted, in addition to a well constituted County Roads Board, in each county.

The result has been in every way satisfactory; the heavy debts have disappeared, splendid roads everywhere distinguish South Wales, and the road rates are not oppressive.

'Rebecca' and her children disappeared from the scene as if for ever, but a few old men survived, and a new grievance having sprung up, very much after their own hearts, young recruits were not wanting when the enforcement of the law for the protection of salmon by the Board of Conservators made their autumn and winter sport of salmon-spearing a grave offence.

It soon became the popular thing among the town and village populations to turn out at night on the banks of the Wye and its tributaries to see 'Rebecca lighting the water;' and picturesque it undoubtedly is to see in midstream half a dozen stalwart young fellows, dressed to the waist in white, with bonnets or handkerchiefs over their heads, and with disguised faces, some with flambeaux on poles, and the others with spears, all standing in a line across a gravelly ford. The poor emaciated salmon, disturbed from his boring in the gravel by the unexpected light, runs like a moth into the candle, and is transfixed by the unerring aim of 'Rebecca.' Tossing it high in the air with a shout of triumph, speedily taken up in responsive echo by the sympathising crowd on the bank of the river, often numbering more than a hundred persons, it is then thrown into a bag, or, as too often is the case now, wantonly left on the river side, a prey for carrion crows. Perhaps in the midst of the fun there is a cry of 'water bailiffs!' and then the lawless part of the business comes out in strong relief. 'Rebecca' on the river bank flings a volley of stones, and often fires off a gun in the air by way of warning; the crowd jostle, chaff, and sometimes add their threats against the intruders, who, if plucky enough to make a dash at their men, nearly always are worsted, and have to retire with broken heads or sore ribs from nailed boots, and the poachers triumph.

Every year, for the last five years, has this tussle between law and disorder been getting more serious. The Duke of Beaufort, having valuable fishing rights on the tideway of the river, has become chairman of the board, and, to protect these interests as well as those of the middle proprietors on the river, he has set himself energetically to work to crush this destruction of fish, while 'Rebecca' on her side only becomes bolder and more pugilistic, until in the present winter twelve serious riots have taken place in Radnorshire alone, and the increase of the police force by twenty men is not considered too strong a measure of precaution.

The area over which this secret organisation extends is about 150,000 acres, of which Radnorshire embraces two-thirds, and Breconshire one-third, and it is impossible not to be alive to the fact that

a genuine grievance is believed to exist among this population, and that the landowners are at no pains to undeceive the people on a question where their own interests lie in the same direction.

Shortly, what 'Rebecca' says is this. 'I used to be able to have a fish (salmon) when I liked; I could catch him with rod and line, or spear, from the commons adjoining the river for many a mile, or on neighbour Jones's land, and a kippered fish in winter was my greatest luxury. I could catch as many samlets as I chose, and my lads could do the same, and it kept them out of mischief. There were plenty of salmon and to spare in those days, and my landlord never interfered nor ordered me not to do it. No keeper interfered with us. They were generally good hands at spearing themselves, and taught my lads the art. Now we are not allowed to look at a salmon, much less to take one. To use a spear is unlawful, and the possession of one dangerous. My old fishing-ground, the commons, has been taken away from me by Inclosure Acts, and has gone to the large landowners. I dare not use a rod and line for a salmon without payment of a heavy annual license. It is equally unlawful for me or my lads to catch a small samlet or laspring as long as my finger, although there are thousands on the streams below my house, and my wife says they are the sweetest little things she ever tasted. There are strange men parading the river night and day, like spies, daring us to touch what we always thought we had a right to take. There are scores of fish there under our eyes, but they belong, they say, now to the Duke, or somebody else, and we have to look on and see them preserved for him, or others for whom we care nothing. Our landlords are not much better off than we are. We are told that the Duke's tenants catch thousands, and that they, and the people below Hereford, are allowed by law to net night and day, except on Saturday and Sunday, and that this prevents any fish coming into our streams until the breeding season begins. We will stand this no longer. We upset the bad law about gates, and we will upset these unfair laws about salmon. We are a God-fearing people, and wish to respect the laws, wherever just and fair, but the salmon were sent us as our lawful food, and no board shall deprive us of them.'

The result is easily told. The Wye, the most beautiful salmon-river in England or Wales, is being denuded of its breeding-fish, steadily but surely, and the number of sporting-fish that reach the upper waters in the fishing season is also diminishing every year. Take the past season, as rather better than its predecessors for summer floods to take up the fish, and we shall find the results lamentably deficient in the best rod-fishings. In Maesllwch water, for instance, in Radnorshire, let at about 500*l.* a year, there have only been fifty fish caught throughout the season, which makes each fish caught cost 10*l.*, exclusive of keepers, &c. Other fishings show a similar return,

and it needs a strong and united effort to prevent a total collapse of the prince of freshwater fish, the noble salmon, in the Wye.

To expect the present Board of Conservators to find a remedy is, I fear, hopeless, made up as it is of three divergent interests, so difficult to harmonise. Of late years the upper proprietors, although numerically superior to the middle and lower proprietors, have been fairly out-generalled. Their bylaws for abolition of night-netting have been rejected by the authorities at the Home Office, and they have now practically retired from the board, and left the business almost entirely in the hands of its present noble chairman and the net-fishing interests. Conciliatory and anxious for the preservation of the river as the noble chairman unquestionably is, he shares no feelings in common with 'Rebecca' and her daughters, and there is little chance of any offer of mediation or concession coming from the board.

Can nothing be done to stem this evil torrent, which disgraces so fair a district? Will not a Liberal Government, for whom Wales has shown so noble a devotion, come forward and legislate beneficially?

R. D. GREEN PRICE.

*LA PHILOSOPHIE DE DIDEROT.
LE DERNIER MOT D'UN MATÉRIALISTE.¹*

La philosophie de Diderot, qui avait été négligée et dédaignée pendant un assez long cours de temps, a repris une grande faveur depuis quelques années, par suite de ses affinités avec les tendances prédominantes de la philosophie contemporaine. On peut dire que Diderot, en effet, a été l'un des précurseurs de cette philosophie. Beaucoup d'idées répandues aujourd'hui et développées avec éclat par les maîtres modernes se trouvent en germe dans ses œuvres. C'était en effet un des esprits les plus *suggestifs* que l'on pût trouver de son temps. Ne lui demandez pas des œuvres méditées, composées avec art, écrites avec goût, liées dans toutes leurs parties : rien chez lui ne vient à maturité ; tout est jeté avec profusion, mais sans ordre et sans règle. Ce ne sont jamais que des fragments, des lueurs éclatantes, mais passagères, d'admirables improvisations : mais tout ce qui est raisonnement suivi, liaison d'idées, enchaînement systématique de propositions, enfin construction régulière et équilibrée, est chose inconnue pour cet esprit fumeux où tout est sans cesse à l'état de bouillonnement et de fermentation. Diderot, malgré d'éminentes qualités qui approchent du génie, n'a donc pas laissé de chef-d'œuvre ; quoique plus riche en idées peut-être que Voltaire et Rousseau, il ne peut être nommé qu'après eux parmi les grands hommes du siècle ; et à plus forte raison n'égale-t-il pas Montesquieu et Buffon. C'est un sublime improvisateur ; telle est l'idée que s'en sont toujours faite ses juges les plus sympathiques et les plus éclairés ; et la nouvelle édition de ses œuvres, la plus complète de toutes, ne modifiera en rien, nous le croyons, cette opinion.

Cette édition se distingue de toutes les précédentes par la publication de pièces inédites qui ont été recueillies dans les papiers de Diderot restés en Russie à la Bibliothèque de l'Ermitage. On sait en effet que Diderot, appelé par la grande Catherine à St.-Petersbourg, y resta quelques années, et qu'il y avait laissé nombre de travaux écrits par lui pendant cette période. Ce sont ces travaux

¹ *Œuvres complètes* de Diderot, revues sur les éditions originales et sur les manuscrits inédits, conservés à la Bibliothèque de l'Ermitage, avec notices, notes, table analytique, par J. Assezat, chez Garnier frères, Paris 1875, 20 volumes in-8.

qui ont été collationnés avec soin et ajoutés par le nouvel éditeur à toutes les œuvres déjà connues. En outre, depuis 1821, date de la dernière édition de Diderot, des suppléments partiels assez importants avaient été publiés séparément ; et il était urgent de les incorporer aux œuvres complètes. Enfin, comme il y avait lieu de craindre que, dans les éditions antérieures, comme il arrive souvent, le texte n'ait été altéré, le nouvel éditeur a confronté ce texte, toutes les fois que cela a été possible, avec le texte des éditions originales données par Diderot lui-même. C'est donc, on peut le dire, l'édition définitive de Diderot que le public a aujourd'hui entre les mains. Cette édition nous est une occasion naturelle de remettre en lumière quelques-unes des pensées les plus importantes d'un auteur si célèbre et cependant si peu lu. Nous croyons qu'il est permis, sans trop forcer les choses, de distinguer, dans la philosophie de Diderot, trois périodes où elle se présente sous des aspects assez différents. Dans la première, il n'est encore qu'un déiste ; il s'attaque seulement au Christianisme ; mais il défend, et nous le croyons avec sincérité, le principe de la religion naturelle. Dans la seconde, il est devenu tout entier lui-même ; il arbore le drapeau du matérialisme, mais d'un matérialisme singulier, aux tendances panthéistiques ; enfin, dans une dernière période, il semble qu'il soit amené à un commencement de réaction contre le matérialisme ; au moins s'en sépare-t-il très-décidément au point de vue moral ; et il se rapproche, pour les tendances, des moralistes de l'école écossaise.

C'est surtout cette troisième phase de la philosophie de Diderot que nous voudrions faire connaître d'après les documents nouveaux : nous devons seulement rappeler les traits essentiels de la doctrine de notre auteur, telle qu'elle résulte de ses écrits antérieurs, et notamment des deux principaux : *L'interprétation de la nature* et le *Rêve de d'Alembert*. Cette philosophie est généralement caractérisée par le nom de matérialisme, et Diderot est regardé par tous comme le coryphée du matérialisme au XVIII^e siècle. On ne peut dire sans doute que cette qualification soit inexacte ; mais il faut reconnaître en même temps que c'est un matérialisme original et assez différent de ce que l'on appelle d'ordinaire de ce nom. Le vrai type en effet du matérialisme, c'est l'atomisme de Démocrite et d'Epicure : c'est l'hypothèse que tous les changements de l'univers sont dus à la rencontre et à la combinaison des molécules primordiales dont les propriétés essentielles sont l'étendue et la solidité. Faire naître l'ordre de l'univers de la rencontre fortuite des atomes, et expliquer la sensibilité de la pensée par la mixtion et la combinaison de ces atomes, voilà le vrai matérialisme, et même, à parler rigoureusement, la seule doctrine qui puisse être appelée de ce nom : car pour être matérialiste, il faut évidemment ramener toutes choses à la matière ; mais il faut alors qu'elle soit définie, et réduite aux qualités qui sont le propre de tous les corps, par conséquent aux propriétés physiques

et mécaniques. Si au contraire on commence par placer dans la matière les qualités propres à l'esprit, on peut se demander si cette hypothèse ne ressemble pas au spiritualisme autant et plus peut-être qu'au matérialisme : or c'est là, nous l'allons voir, la philosophie propre de Diderot.

Cette doctrine sur l'essence de la matière est au fond celle que Maupertuis, sous le nom du 'Docteur Baumann,' avait exposé dans une thèse écrite en latin, et qu'il a depuis publiée en français sous le titre de *Système de la Nature*.² Dans ce travail, Maupertuis combattait la théorie des atomes, celle des natures plastiques, celle des archées et enfin celle de l'emboîtement des germes ; et il substituait à toutes ces hypothèses celle d'une sensibilité essentielle à la matière. Il attribuait aux molécules primordiales le désir, l'aversion, la mémoire, l'intelligence, 'en un mot, toutes les qualités que nous reconnaissons dans les animaux, que les anciens comprenaient sous le nom d'âme sensitive, et que le docteur Baumann admet, proportion gardée des formes et des masses, dans les particules les plus petites de la matière comme dans le plus gros animal.' Diderot fait quelques réserves sur cette hypothèse ; mais elles nous semblent plus apparentes que réelles, et sont plutôt des précautions que des objections. Il y voit des périls pour l'existence de Dieu et l'existence de l'âme ; mais ces deux questions mises à part peut-être par simple prudence, il accepte au fond l'hypothèse tout en cherchant à l'atténuer. Il ne fallait pas, suivant lui, se précipiter dans l'espèce de matérialisme le plus séduisant en attribuant aux molécules organiques le désir, l'aversion, le sentiment et la pensée. Il fallait se contenter de supposer une sensibilité mille fois moindre que celle que le Tout-Puissant a accordée aux animaux les plus voisins de la matière morte. En vertu de cette 'sensibilité sourde,' Diderot suppose que chaque molécule, sollicitée par 'une inquiétude automate,' cherche à se procurer la situation la plus commode de toutes, comme fait l'animal dans le sommeil ; il eût défini l'animal un 'système de molécules organiques qui, par l'impulsion d'une sensation semblable à un *toucher obtus*, se sont combinées, jusqu'à ce que chacune ait rencontré la place la plus convenable à sa figure et à son repos.' Il est difficile de démêler la différence qu'il y aurait entre un tel système et celui de Maupertuis. Celui-ci n'entendait certainement pas que les atomes possédassent les mêmes facultés que les animaux supérieurs ; il n'aurait pas chicané sur le degré, et sans doute il ne se serait pas refusé à admettre que la sensibilité qu'il prêtait aux molécules est 'mille fois moindre' que celle du moindre animalcule ; car le degré ne fait rien à l'affaire. Diderot ne se sépare donc de Maupertuis qu'en apparence : au fond il lui emprunte son hypothèse, en ne la modifiant que dans la forme. Si nous essayons de remonter à l'origine de cette hypothèse, il est facile de voir qu'elle dérive directement de

² *Œuvres de Maupertuis*, tom. 2.

la monadologie de Leibniz. Maupertuis était le président de l'Académie de Berlin, fondée par Leibniz ; or cette Académie était le centre du monadisme leibnizien. Maupertuis lui-même, sur bien des points (par exemple sur le principe de la moindre action), se rattache directement aux Leibnizianisme. Or, on sait que Leibniz définissait la substance 'ce qui est capable d'action,' et il y reconnaissait deux attributs fondamentaux, *l'appétit* et la *perception*. Il suffisait de supprimer l'attribut de l'étendue pour que de telles substances simples, actives par essence, perceptives et appétitives, fussent de véritables âmes ; et Leibniz disait en effet qu'elles sont 'analogues à nos âmes.' C'est ce système que Maupertuis avait développé et que Diderot lui emprunta comme 'le matérialisme le plus séduisant.' Mais on peut se demander encore une fois si un tel système ne mériterait pas plutôt le nom d'ultra-spiritualisme, puisqu'au lieu de faire l'esprit analogue à la matière, comme les atomistes, il représente au contraire la matière comme analogue à l'esprit.

Dans le *Rêve de d'Alembert*, Diderot a repris en son propre nom et soutenu hardiment l'hypothèse d'une sensibilité essentielle à la matière ; il y expose une sorte de panthéisme vitaliste et hylozoïste qui se rapprocherait plus de la philosophie stoïcienne que de la philosophie épicurienne. 'Il n'y a plus qu'une substance dans l'univers, dans l'homme et dans l'animal. La serinette est de bois ;^a l'homme est de chair ; le serin est de chair ; le musicien est d'une chair diversement organisée ; mais l'un et l'autre ont une même origine, une même formation, une même fin.' D'Alembert objecte que si la sensibilité est essentielle à la matière, il faut que la pierre sente. 'Pourquoi non ?' répond Diderot. Il prétend qu'on fait 'du marbre avec de la chair, et de la chair avec du marbre,' en broyant le marbre, en le mettant en poussière, en l'incorporant à une terre végétale.^b Il distingue une 'sensibilité active,' celle des êtres vivants, et une 'sensibilité inerte,' celle de la matière morte. Enfin il conclut que 'depuis l'éléphant jusqu'au puceron, depuis le puceron jusqu'à la molécule sensible et vivante, l'origine de tout, pas un point dans la nature entière qui ne souffre ou qui ne jouisse.' Toutes ces propositions étaient déjà implicitement contenues dans le livre de *l'Interprétation de la nature*. Mais ici Diderot creuse plus avant que n'avait fait Maupertuis, et qu'il n'avait fait lui-même dans le livre précédent : il se sépare nettement de la doctrine monadiste. Cette doctrine en effet consiste à donner à l'individu une valeur substantielle, et à réduire les corps à des substances simples douées chacune de caractères propres et individuels. Si on admet de telles substances, on admet par là même des âmes ; et l'âme humaine n'est qu'une de ces substances, douée de la faculté de réfléchir et de se replier sur elle-même. Diderot est entièrement opposé à cette

^a Diderot vient de comparer l'organisme vivant à un instrument de musique.

doctrine. Pour lui, il n'y a point d'individu. 'Que voulez-vous dire avec vos individus? Il n'y en a pas; non, il n'y en a pas. Il n'y a qu'un seul grand individu: c'est le tout. Dans ce tout, comme dans une machine, comme dans un animal quelconque, il y a une partie que vous appelez telle ou telle; mais quand vous donnez le nom d'individu à cette partie du tout, c'est par un concept aussi faux que si, dans un oiseau, vous donniez le nom d'individu à l'aile, à une plume de l'aile.' S'il n'y a pas d'individu même corporel, à plus forte raison n'y a-t-il pas d'individu spirituel. L'âme est inutile: 'Vous en voulez,' dit d'Alembert, 'à la distinction des deux substances?' 'Je ne m'en cache pas,' répond Diderot. 'Cependant ne faut-il pas un entendement, distinct de l'instrument dont il se sert? Non, il faut seulement distinguer l'instrument philosophe de l'instrument clavecin. L'instrument philosophe est sensible; il est à la fois le musicien et l'instrument. Nous sommes des instruments doués de sensibilité et de mémoire.' 'Mais,' dit d'Alembert, 'la sensibilité est une qualité simple, et incompatible avec un sujet, un supposé divisible. Galimatias!' répond Diderot. 'Ne voyez-vous pas que toutes les qualités sont essentiellement indivisibles? Il n'y a ni plus ni moins d'impénétrabilité; il y a la moitié d'un corps rond, mais non la moitié de la rondeur.' Enfin Diderot, qui ne se soucie pas beaucoup de conséquence et de cohérence, invoque 'l'indivisibilité de l'atome,' quoiqu'il n'admette pas d'individus. Ce n'est pas ici le lieu de discuter toutes ces idées; disons seulement que Diderot ne va pas au fond de la difficulté: cette difficulté est que la rondeur et l'impénétrabilité ne se perçoivent pas elles-mêmes, n'ont pas conscience d'elles-mêmes: leur unité vient de la pensée qui les pense; mais d'où vient l'unité de la pensée qui se pense elle-même? Diderot croit expliquer ce fait par la mémoire: mais comment deux idées sont-elles à la fois présentes à l'esprit, et celle que je pense actuellement, et celle que j'ai pensée autrefois? Diderot nous dit que 'la corde vibrante sensible oscille longtemps encore après qu'on l'a pincée, et qu'elle en fait frémir d'autres.' On peut se demander si ce ne sont pas là de pures métaphores.

Nous n'insisterons pas sur un des points les plus curieux de cette philosophie, qui a été récemment mis en lumière par un savant français avec un grand talent, à savoir le transformisme de Diderot.⁴ Il est bien certain, d'après les textes cités par M. Caro, que le véritable ancêtre du transformisme en France n'est ni Lamarck, ni Robinet, comme on l'a dit, mais Diderot. C'est lui qui a dit le premier qu'il n'y a jamais eu qu' 'un seul animal,' et que la nature entière n'est qu' 'un même phénomène transformé.' C'est encore là un trait original et supérieur qui distingue son matérialisme de celui de ses contemporains. Il n'attribue pas la production des êtres de

⁴ *Revue des Deux-Mondes*, 15 Octobre 1879, 'De l'Idée transformiste dans Diderot' par E. Caro.

la nature à de simples combinaisons extérieures. Il voit dans l'univers entier, comme les stoïciens, un être vivant qui a en lui-même le principe de son développement. Ce système est moins matérialisme que spiritualisme. C'est une sorte de vitalisme universel très supérieur au *fortuitisme* (s'il est permis d'ainsi parler) des anciens atomistes

Non-seulement le matérialisme de Diderot est d'un ordre supérieur à celui de son temps, mais nous allons voir que lui-même (et c'est un des résultats les plus nouveaux de la publication récente) semble s'être éloigné plus tard de son propre point de vue, et qu'à la fin de sa vie, provoqué par les excès de ses propres opinions, et en particulier par le livre plat et superficiel d'Helvétius, il avait fait un mouvement en arrière, et élevé lui-même des doutes et des objections contre le principe et les conséquences du matérialisme. C'est ce qui ressort de sa *Réfutation de l'ouvrage d'Helvétius intitulé l'Homme*, réfutation écrite en 1773 ou 1774. Résumons les principaux points de cette curieuse réfutation.

Helvétius avait posé ce principe, d'où dérive toute la psychologie matérialiste : *sentir, c'est penser*. Ce principe avait déjà été l'objet d'une forte et pénétrante discussion de J.-J. Rousseau dans le *Vicaire savoyard*. Diderot paraît incliner vers l'opinion de Rousseau, et se sépare de celle d'Helvétius : 'Sentir, c'est juger,' dit-il. Cette assertion, comme elle est exprimée, ne me paraît pas rigoureusement vraie. Le stupide sent, mais peut-être ne juge-t-il pas. L'être totalement privé de mémoire sent, mais peut-être ne juge-t-il pas : le jugement suppose la comparaison de deux idées. Diderot voit très-bien le nœud de la question : c'est de savoir 'comment nous avons deux idées présentes à la fois ; ou comment, ne les ayant pas présentes, cependant nous les comparons.' Tout le dix-huitième siècle, sur les traces de Condillac, avait expliqué jusque là toutes les opérations intellectuelles comme des transformations de la sensation ; et l'on peut dire que Diderot lui-même dans ses écrits matérialistes avait admis implicitement cette doctrine. Ici au contraire, il s'en sépare décidément, ou du moins il élève contre elle les doutes les plus sérieux. Il affirme que cette doctrine 'convient à l'animal plutôt qu'à l'homme.' Il insiste sur le caractère hypothétique de ces transformations arbitraires : 'Passer brusquement de la sensibilité physique, c'est-à-dire de ce que je ne suis pas une plante, une pierre, un métal, à l'amour du bonheur, de l'amour du bonheur à l'intérêt, de l'intérêt à l'attention, de l'attention à la comparaison des idées ; je ne saurais m'accommoder de ces généralités-là ; je suis homme, et il me faut des causes propres à l'homme.' Ces doutes ne portent encore que sur le principe de la psychologie sensualiste. Voici qui va plus loin, et qui touche jusqu'au matérialisme même : 'J'estimerai davantage,' dit-il, 'celui qui par l'expérience ou l'observation démontrera rigoureusement que la sensibilité physique appartient

aussi essentiellement à la matière que l'impénétrabilité, ou qui la déduira sans réplique de l'organisation.' Il montre les difficultés des deux hypothèses : d'une part en effet 'il faut convenir que *l'organisation*, c'est-à-dire la coordination des parties inertes, *ne mène point du tout à la sensibilité*.' D'autre part, '*la sensibilité générale des molécules n'est qu'une supposition qui tire toute sa force des difficultés dont elle débarrasse : ce qui ne suffit pas en bonne philosophie*.' Ainsi cette hypothèse que Diderot avait avancée déjà après Maupertuis, dans l'*Interprétation de la nature*, et qu'il avait développée si hardiment dans le *Rêve de d'Alembert*, n'est plus pour lui qu'une supposition arbitraire pour se débarrasser des difficultés, ce qui ne suffit pas en bonne philosophie. N'oublions pas d'ailleurs que l'autre hypothèse, celle qui fait naître la sensibilité de l'organisation, a toujours paru inadmissible à Diderot, et qu'elle ne peut lui être imputée. Enfin, lors même qu'on admettrait cette proposition d'une sensibilité essentielle à la matière, ce serait encore, nous l'avons vu, une question de savoir si cette proposition elle-même serait un aveu de matérialisme, ou si elle ne serait pas plutôt le renversement même du matérialisme.

C'est encore s'éloigner du matérialisme que de distinguer, comme fait Diderot dans ce dernier écrit, la *condition* et la *cause* presque dans les mêmes termes que l'ont fait Platon, Aristote, et Leibniz. Helvétius disait : 'La sensibilité physique est la *cause unique* de nos actions et de nos pensées.' Diderot répond : '*Condition primitive*, cela est incontestable ; mais la *cause*, la *cause unique*, c'est ce qui me semble presque aussi évidemment faux.' L'exemple qu'il choisit pour prouver cette distinction, rappelle celui de Socrate dans le *Phédon* : 'Il faut que je marche pour aller rue St. Anne, causer avec un certain philosophe que j'aime ; mais n'y vais-je que parce que j'ai des pieds ? Ces actions sont sans doute réductibles en dernière analyse à la sensibilité physique, mais comme *condition*, mais non comme *cause*, *but*, ou *motif*.' C'est tout à fait dans le même sens, et presque dans les mêmes termes, que Socrate disait :

N'est-ce pas comme si quelqu'un disait : tout ce que Socrate fait, il le fait avec intelligence, et qu'ensuite, voulant rendre raison de chaque chose que je fais, dirait qu'aujourd'hui, par exemple, je suis ici assis sur mon lit, parce que mon corps est composé d'os et de nerfs ; que les os, étant durs et solides, sont séparés par des jointures, et que les muscles lient les os avec les chairs, et la peau qui les renferme et les embrasse les uns et les autres . . . ; ou bien encore, c'est comme si, pour expliquer la cause de notre entretien, il la cherchait dans le son de la voix, dans l'air, dans l'âme, et dans mille autre choses semblables, sans songer à parler de la véritable cause ; savoir, que les Athéniens ayant jugé qu'il était mieux de me condamner, j'ai trouvé aussi qu'il était mieux d'être assis sur ce lit et d'attendre tranquillement la peine qu'ils m'ont imposée ; car je vous jure que depuis longtemps ces muscles et ces os seraient à Mégare ou en Béotie, si j'avais cru que cela fût finieux, et si je n'avais pensé que cela fût plus juste et plus beau de rester ici pour subir la peine à laquelle la patrie m'a condamné, que de m'échapper et de m'enfuir

comme un esclave. Mais il est trop ridicule de donner ces raisons-là . . . *autre chose est la cause, et autre chose ce sans quoi la cause ne serait jamais cause.*

Diderot revient avec insistance sur cette distinction fondamentale de la *condition* et de la *cause* : 'Je vous contredis, donc j'existe ; fort bien ; mais : je vous contredis *parce que* j'existe, cela n'est pas ; pas plus que : il faut un pistolet pour faire sauter la cervelle ; donc je fais sauter la cervelle parce que j'ai un pistolet. . . Il faut une scie pour scier ; mais il n'a pas vu qu'on ne sciait pas par la raison qu'on avait une scie.'

Sans doute, il faut se garder de rien exagérer, et de prêter ici à Diderot plus de spiritualisme qu'il n'en a ; car le fond de son objection est qu'Helvétius a attaché trop d'importance aux sens externes, et pas assez à l'organe interne, à l'organe cérébral lui-même :

Il y a cinq sens ; voilà les cinq témoins ; mais *le juge ou le rapporteur* ? Il y a un organe particulier, le cerveau, auquel les cinq témoins font leur rapport, cet organe méritait bien un examen particulier. Il y a deux sortes de stupides : les uns le sont par des sens hébétés ; les autres, avec des sens exquis, par une mauvaise conformation du cerveau. C'est où j'attends l'auteur qui a pris l'outil nécessaire à l'ouvrage pour la raison de l'ouvrier . . . Il y a cinq sens excellents, mais la tête est mal organisée ; les témoins sont fidèles, mais le juge est corrompu.

Il ne s'agirait donc, après tout, que d'opposer le cerveau aux sens externes ; ce qui n'aurait, sans doute, rien de contraire à un matérialisme intelligent. Mais nous avons vu plus haut que Diderot croyait peu à l'explication de la sensibilité (et à fortiori de l'intelligence) par l'organisation, et préférerait l'hypothèse d'une sensibilité essentielle à la matière ; et encore était-il tout près de reconnaître que c'était là une supposition gratuite. On voit à combien peu se réduisait en définitive son matérialisme.

Quoi qu'il en soit, d'ailleurs, et quelle que fût l'essence de ce qu'il appelait la *raison*, l'*âme*, il l'opposait, comme l'ont fait Aristote ou Bossuet, à la sensibilité physique en termes des plus explicites :

Pourquoi l'homme est-il perfectible ? (dit-il), et pourquoi l'animal ne l'est-il pas ?—L'animal ne l'est pas parce que sa raison, s'il en a une, est dominée par un seul despote qui le subjugué. *Toute l'âme du chien est au bout de son nez.* Toute l'âme de l'aigle est dans son œil ; l'âme de la taupe est dans son oreille. Mais il n'en est pas ainsi de l'homme. Il est entre ses sens une telle harmonie qu'aucun ne prédomine assez sur les autres pour donner la loi à son entendement : c'est son entendement au contraire ou l'organe de sa raison qui est le plus fort. C'est un juge qui n'est ni corrompu, ni subjugué par aucun des témoins ; il conserve toute son autorité, et il en use pour se perfectionner.

Diderot se demande ce qui arriverait si l'homme était réduit à n'être autre chose qu' 'un œil vivant ou une oreille vivante.' Un tel être serait-il capable de juger, de penser, de raisonner ? 'Oui,' dit Helvétius, 'car cette œil vivant aurait de la mémoire.' 'J'y consens,' dit Diderot (conclusion déjà très large). 'S'il a de la mémoire,' dit Helvétius, 'il comparera ses sensations ; il raisonnera.' 'Oui,' dit

Diderot, 'mais comme le chien raisonne; moins encore.' Il en est de même des autres sens; et 'l'homme d'Helvétius se réduira à la réunion de cinq consciences très imparfaites.' En un mot, ce qui manque à l'homme d'Helvétius, et ce que Diderot réclame avec profondeur et sagacité, c'est l'unité, le lien, le *sensorium commune*: 'Sans un correspondant et un juge commun de toutes les sensations, sans un organe commémoratif de tout ce qui nous arrive, l'instrument sensible et vivant de chaque sens aurait peut-être une conscience momentanée de son existence, mais il n'y aurait certainement aucune conscience de l'animal ou de l'homme entier.' Sans doute, Diderot veut parler ici d'un organe central; mais cet organe central lui-même n'est-il pas composé d'organes? il leur faut donc un centre; et ce centre des centres sera encore lui-même composé, et cela à l'infini, tant qu'on ne sera pas arrivé à un centre véritable, c'est-à-dire à une unité véritable, et non à une unité de composition. C'est ainsi que la critique d'Helvétius conduirait insensiblement Diderot, s'il suivait sa pensée jusqu'au bout, à des conclusions décidément spiritualistes ou idéalistes.

Au reste, notre philosophe n'admet pas seulement un organe central; il en admet deux: l'un qui est le centre des idées, l'autre le centre des émotions. Le premier est le cerveau; le second est le diaphragme: Helvétius n'a étudié ni l'un ni l'autre. Il y a cependant deux sensibilités: l'une physique, propre à toutes les parties de l'animal; l'autre propre au diaphragme: 'C'est là le siège de toutes nos peines et de tous nos plaisirs: ses oscillations ou crispations sont plus ou moins fortes dans un être que dans un autre; c'est elle qui caractérise les âmes pusillanimes et les âmes fortes; la tête fait les hommes sages; le diaphragme les hommes compâtissants et moraux.' L'opposition de la tête et du diaphragme correspond pour Diderot à l'opposition de l'esprit et du cœur. Ce qu'il reproche à Helvétius, c'est d'avoir ignoré 'ces deux grands ressorts de l'homme.' Mais il oublie de se demander à lui-même si ce sont là deux centres séparés et indépendants, et si l'un n'est pas subordonné à l'autre; dans le premier cas, il y aurait deux consciences distinctes; et où serait alors ce qu'il appelle lui-même 'la conscience de l'homme entier'?

Il n'est donc pas douteux qu'en cherchant l'essence de l'homme non dans les sens externes, mais dans l'organisation intérieure, Diderot tend à s'éloigner de plus en plus du matérialisme, même lorsqu'il cherche encore dans les organes l'explication de la pensée et du sentiment: car c'est s'éloigner du matérialisme que de se retirer du dehors au dedans. Signalons encore, dans le même ordre d'idées, quelques points curieux et intéressants de cette critique. Helvétius, expliquant tout par le dehors, cherche une loi qui établisse un certain rapport entre la sensation et ce que nous appellerions aujourd'hui l'*excitation*, c'est-à-dire l'impression produite sur l'organe par une action externe. Voici, suivant Diderot, la loi proposée par Helvétius:

‘Un coup,’ dit-il, ‘fait de la douleur à deux êtres différents dans le rapport de deux à un ; un coup double produira une douleur double dans l’un ou dans l’autre.’ Cette loi en supposerait d’abord une autre : c’est qu’un coup double produit sur chacun séparément une douleur double. Or, ce serait là un résultat contraire aux faits, s’il fallait s’en référer à la célèbre loi (très contestée d’ailleurs) connue sous le nom de *Loi de Fechner*. Suivant cette loi, en effet, la sensation ne croîtrait pas comme l’excitation, mais comme le *logarithme de l’excitation*. Mais laissons de côté le rapport de la sensation à l’excitation dans chaque individu, et considérons le rapport des deux éléments dans deux individus différents. C’est ici que se présente l’objection de Diderot : il s’en faut de beaucoup, suivant lui, qu’il soit permis d’admettre comme une loi que la sensation soit toujours proportionnelle à l’impression :

Qui vous a dit que le plaisir et la douleur soient dans le rapport constant des impressions ? Un mouvement de joie s’excite dans deux êtres par un récit ; la suite du récit double l’impression dans l’un et dans l’autre ; et voilà Jean qui rit de plus belle, et Pierre qui se trouve mal. Le plaisir s’est transformé en douleur ; la quantité qui était positive est devenue négative. Le coup simple les fait crier tous deux ; le coup double rend le cri de l’un plus aigu, et tue l’autre. On ne saurait accroître à discrétion le plaisir et la douleur ; le plaisir extrême se transforme en douleur ; l’extrême douleur amène le transport, le délire, l’insensibilité et la mort.

C’est encore en faisant prédominer l’importance de l’organisation interne sur l’organisation externe, et du centre sur les parties, que Diderot oppose à Helvétius l’instinct propre dans les espèces animales, et la vocation spéciale et différente des individus parmi les hommes. Dans l’hypothèse, en effet, du pur sensualisme, l’homme ou l’animal ne serait qu’une table rase ; les individus dans l’humanité, comme les espèces animales, ne différeraient que par des accidents externes. De là cette opinion célèbre d’Helvétius que toutes les intelligences sont égales, et ne diffèrent que par l’éducation. Diderot poursuit cette doctrine par les arguments les plus nombreux et les plus décisifs.

Il insiste d’abord sur le caractère spécifique de l’instinct chez les animaux :

On ne donne pas du nez à un lévrier : on ne donne pas la vitesse du lévrier au chien-couchant ; vous aurez beau faire : celui-ci gardera son nez, et celui-là gardera ses jambes. Pourquoi n’en serait-il pas de même parmi les hommes ? Pourquoi n’y aurait-il pas dans l’espèce humaine la même variété d’individus que dans la race des chiens, pourquoi chacun n’aurait-il pas son allure et son gibier ?

Helvétius veut tout rapporter aux circonstances extérieures, aux accidents de l’éducation, et, en dernier mot, au hasard. A ce compte l’éducation devrait tout faire : ‘Si je vous confie cinq cents enfants, combien nous rendrez-vous d’hommes de génie ? Pourquoi pas cinq cents ?’ Helvétius cite comme exemple de hasard qui provoque la vocation, Vaucanson qui, enfermé par sa mère dans une cellule soli-

taire, n'avait pour se distraire qu'une horloge dont le balancier éveille sa curiosité. Mais comment ce hasard a-t-il pu développer ce génie de la mécanique, si ce génie ne préexistait pas auparavant ? 'Donnez-moi la mère de Vaucanson, et je ne ferai pas davantage le flûteur automate. Envoyez-moi en exil, ou enfermez-moi à la Bastille, je n'en sortirai pas le *Paradis perdu* à la main.' Suivant Helvétius, J.-J. Rousseau pouvait encore être considéré comme un chef-d'œuvre du hasard. Ce serait par hasard qu'ayant vu le programme proposé par l'Académie de Dijon sur l'influence morale des lettres et des arts, il avait reçu de Diderot lui-même, alors à la Bastille, la première impulsion qui devait décider de toute sa carrière d'écrivain. 'Mais,' répond Diderot, 'Rousseau fit ce qu'il devait faire parce que c'était lui ; j'aurais fait tout autre chose parce que c'était moi . . . si l'impertinente question de Dijon n'avait pas été posée, Rousseau eût-il été moins capable de faire son discours ? on sut que Démosthène était éloquent quand il eût parlé ; mais il l'était avant d'avoir ouvert la bouche.' Helvétius confond donc encore ici l'occasion ou la condition accidentelle avec la cause essentielle. Un baril de poudre peut rester sans explosion si une étincelle ne vient l'enflammer. Mais ce n'est pas l'étincelle qui rend la poudre explosible. De plus, l'éducation et les hasards peuvent-ils rendre passionnés les hommes nés froids ? On peut, par l'éducation, rendre les hommes bons ou méchants ; on ne peut les rendre spirituels. 'Un père peut contraindre son fils à une bonne action ; mais il serait une bête féroce, s'il lui disait : *Maroufle, fais donc de l'esprit.*' Les idées, dit Helvétius, viennent de la mémoire. Fort bien ; mais, la mémoire d'où vient-elle ? La mémoire, dit-on, peut dépendre d'une chute, d'un accident ? Oui ; mais pourquoi pas aussi d'un organe naturellement vicié ? Suivant Helvétius, on peut se faire à volonté, poète, orateur ou peintre. Rien de plus faux : 'On citerait à peine un seul homme (Michel Ange par exemple), qui ait su faire en même temps un bon poème et un beau tableau.' Parmi les écrivains chacun a son style, s'il est original, et ne peut l'échanger contre le style de son voisin : 'Voici trois styles différents : celui-ci est simple, clair, sans figures, sans mouvement, sans couleur : c'est le style de d'Alembert et du géomètre. Cet autre est large, majestueux, abondant, plein d'images ; c'est celui de l'historien de la nature et de Buffon. Ce troisième est véhément, il touche, il trouble, il agite ; il élève ou calme les passions : c'est celui du moraliste ou de Rousseau.' Qui croira que d'Alembert pourrait, s'il le voulait, écrire comme Rousseau, et Rousseau comme Buffon ? Helvétius pousse le paradoxe jusqu'à soutenir qu'être capable de comprendre une vérité, c'est être capable de la découvrir. Or tous les hommes, suivant lui, sont capables, avec de l'étude, de comprendre le système de Newton. Ils pourraient donc l'avoir découvert. Diderot conteste d'abord la mineure de ce raisonnement, à savoir que tous les hommes sont capables de comprendre

certaines vérités : ' Pendant longtemps, il n'y eût que trois hommes en Europe capables de comprendre la géométrie de Descartes.' Mais de plus, ' quelle assertion, grand Dieu ! Inventer une chose ou l'entendre, et l'entendre avec un maître, c'est la même chose ! ' Helvétius réduit tout au hasard. Cependant ' lorsqu'on demanda à Newton comment il avait découvert le système du monde, il ne répondit pas : par hasard ; mais : en y pensant toujours. Un autre aurait ajouté : et parce que c'était lui.' On voit que Diderot est inépuisable et infatigable dans sa réfutation du célèbre paradoxe d'Helvétius, à savoir l'égalité radicale des intelligences, paradoxe qui suppose que toutes les différences sont accidentelles. Diderot admet au contraire des innéités : il cherche la cause des différences en dedans et non au dehors ; et en supposant que le matérialisme fût désintéressé dans la question et pût s'accommoder d'une opinion aussi bien que de l'autre, au moins faudrait-il admettre qu'un matérialisme qui cherche l'explication du génie dans la constitution intime de l'organe le plus délicat et le plus subtil, est d'un ordre supérieur à celui qui ramène tout à des circonstances fortuites : car l'organisation au moins est une cause, et le hasard n'en est pas une. Et d'ailleurs, le même mode d'argumentation que Diderot emploie contre Helvétius pourrait être poussé plus loin, et contre toute explication physique : car on peut tout aussi bien dire du cerveau ce qu'Helvétius dit des sens externes ou des circonstances fortuites, à savoir qu'il n'est que la condition, mais non la cause ultime des phénomènes de la pensée.

Le point le plus important de la réfutation d'Helvétius, et par lequel Diderot s'éloigne le plus du matérialisme, c'est la discussion du paradoxe par lequel Diderot ramène à la sensibilité physique toutes les qualités morales et toutes les vertus. Ici c'est le cœur du philosophe qui se révolte ; c'est son âme généreuse et passionnée qui prend parti contre une des conséquences les plus évidentes et les plus fâcheuses du système matérialiste. Il parle presque comme J.-J. Rousseau dans *l'Emile* : ' Que se propose celui qui sacrifie sa vie ? Codrus et Décus allaient-ils chercher quelque jouissance physique dans un sépulchre au fond d'un abîme ? ' Suivant Helvétius, le remords ne serait que ' la prévoyance du mal physique auquel le crime découvert nous exposerait. '— ' C'est là, ' répond Diderot, ' le remords du scélérat. ' Mais n'en est-il pas un autre ? Lors même que le plaisir serait le but des actions, encore devrions-nous distinguer ' le plaisir et l'attente du plaisir, ' distinction que faisait déjà Epicure lui-même. Le plaisir est tout physique ; l'attente du plaisir est déjà un phénomène de tout autre ordre. ' La maladie et la crainte de tomber malade sont-elles une même chose ? La faim est dans le gosier ; la crainte de la faim est dans l'entendement. ' Helvétius disait brutalement que pour le soldat qui va à la tranchée, l'écu de la solde est ' représentatif d'une pinte d'eau-de-vie. ' Diderot lui oppose l'exemple de ce soldat à qui l'on offrait cent louis pour trahir,

et qui répondait : 'Mon capitaine, reprenez vos cent louis : cela ne se fait pas pour de l'argent.' A la plate et pauvre doctrine d'Helvétius, Diderot oppose l'enthousiasme du savant, du patriote, de l'homme religieux :

Comment résoudre-vous, en dernière analyse, sans un pitoyable abus de mots, ce généreux enthousiasme qui expose les hommes à la perte de leur liberté, de leur fortune, de leur honneur et de leur vie ? Quel rapport entre l'héroïsme insensé de quelques hommes religieux et les biens de ce monde ? Ce n'est pas de s'enivrer de vins délicieux, de se plonger dans un torrent de voluptés sensuelles ; ils s'en passent ici, et n'en espèrent pas là haut ; ce n'est pas de regorger de richesses ; ils donnent ce qu'ils en ont. Voilà ce qu'il faut expliquer. Quand on établit une loi générale, il faut qu'elle embrasse tous les phénomènes, et les actions de la sagesse et les écarts de la folie.

Dans la doctrine d'Helvétius la plupart des règles de la morale s'expliquent par des conventions sociales. Diderot combat encore cette doctrine : 'Qu'un sauvage,' dit-il, 'monte à un arbre pour cueillir des fruits, et qu'un autre sauvage survienne pour s'emparer de ses fruits, celui-ci ne s'enfuira-t-il pas avec son vol ? Il me semble que, par sa fuite, il décèlera la conscience de son injustice et qu'il s'avouera punissable ; il me semble que le spolié s'indignera, poursuivra le voleur, et aura conscience de l'injure qu'on lui aura faite. Le sauvage n'a pas de mots pour désigner le juste et l'injuste ; il crie ; mais ce cri est-il vide de sens ? N'est-ce que le cri de l'animal ?' Entre l'homme et l'animal, il se peut que la seule loi soit la loi de la force : mais en est-il de même d'homme à homme ? 'L'homme pense-t-il d'un lion qui l'attaque comme d'un tyran qui l'écrase ? Non. Quelle différence met-il donc entre ces deux malfaiteurs, si elle ne dérive pas de quelque prérogative naturelle, de quelque idée confuse de la justice ? Mais si le persécuté a cette idée, pourquoi manquerait-elle au persécutateur ?'

On peut trouver que cette réfutation d'Helvétius n'est pas assez philosophique, qu'elle est œuvre de sentiment, plus que d'analyse et de critique sévère. Lui-même semble le dire : 'Cet ouvrage m'attriste de tout, il m'ôte mes plus douces illusions.' Peu nous importe : car il ne s'agit pas ici pour nous de réfuter Helvétius : ce qui nous intéresse, c'est de voir Diderot se révolter à son tour contre les conséquences morales du matérialisme. C'est le même sentiment qui a animé Rousseau dans le *Vicaire savoyard*, et qui lui avait fait écrire également un examen critique d'Helvétius. L'un et l'autre défendent la conscience et la morale du cœur contre le scepticisme moral : 'Je consens que le fort opprime le faible ; ce que j'ai peine à concevoir, c'est qu'il n'ait ni la conscience de son injustice, ni le remords de son action. Fut-il un temps où l'homme pût être confondu avec la brute ? Je ne le pense pas.' Comme Rousseau, Diderot défend encore contre Helvétius le sentiment de la pitié. 'Pourquoi le cerf aux abois m'émeut-il ?' C'est à cause de la nouveauté du fait, dit Helvétius. Mais 'la nouveauté surprend et ne touche pas.

Cette commisération est d'animal à animal : c'est une illusion rapide amenée par des symptômes de douleur communs à l'homme et à l'animal, et qui nous montre l'homme à la place d'un cerf.'

Tel est en substance cet écrit, composé de notes fragmentaires, et que l'on ne peut appeler un ouvrage, mais qui est très important, parce qu'il paraît être le dernier écrit philosophique de l'auteur, et qu'il marque une phase nouvelle dans la doctrine de Diderot. On ne pourrait aller jusqu'à dire que c'est une rétractation et un désaveu : ce serait dépasser la vérité ; mais c'est au moins un arrêt, et un commencement de retour en arrière. Il est certain que les deux livres d'Helvétius, le livre de l'*Esprit* et le livre de l'*Homme*, ont été le point extrême et culminant du matérialisme au dix-huitième siècle. A partir de l'*Emile*, les idées opposées, réveillées par l'éloquence de Rousseau, ont repris la prépondérance. Rousseau, Turgot, Bernardin de St.-Pierre, et au début du siècle suivant Chateaubriand et Mme de Staël, voilà le mouvement progressif qu'a suivi depuis cette époque l'opposition au matérialisme. Or, il est visible que, sans en avoir tout à fait conscience, Diderot a été entraîné un des premiers dans ce mouvement. Il y avait en lui un souffle et une vie qui débordaient au delà des limites étroites et des formules sèches du matérialisme. S'il eût eu plus de science philosophique, plus de force de raisonnement, il eût été plus loin dans cette voie. Nul doute qu'une philosophie comme l'idéalisme allemand de notre siècle ne l'eût facilement conquis. Ce ne sera donc toujours qu'avec quelques réserves que l'on devra donner à Diderot la qualification de matérialiste, et en ajoutant que son matérialisme, s'il mérite ce nom, est d'un ordre supérieur à celui de d'Holbach, d'Helvétius, et de Lamettrie. C'est pourquoi Goethe, qui estimait si peu la philosophie française du dix-huitième siècle, a toujours mis à part la personne et le génie de Diderot. Il se reconnaissait en quelque sorte lui-même dans cette nature enthousiaste et encyclopédique, passionnée à la fois pour les arts et pour les sciences, ivre de vie en tous sens. Ce qui manque cependant à Diderot pour être Goethe, c'est l'art et la poésie. Il y a toujours en Diderot quelque chose de grossier et de sensuel qui ne lui permet pas de s'élever au premier rang : mais il est le premier des hommes de génie du second rang. Quelques admirateurs excessifs pourront trouver peut-être encore ce jugement trop sévère : c'est jusqu'ici cependant celui qu'a porté la postérité ; et nous ne croyons pas qu'il y ait lieu à le réviser.

PAUL JANET.



THE INCOMPATIBLES.

THE Irish Land Bill has not yet, at the moment when I write this, made its appearance, and it seems we are not to set eyes upon it until April is a week old. An additional paper on Irish affairs, even if the Land Bill could be discussed in it, is an offering which, perhaps, people may be expected to receive with weariness and terror rather than with a cheerful welcome. And above all, they may resent being troubled with a paper on these grave and sad affairs by an insignificant person, and one who has no special connexion with Ireland.

But even the most insignificant Englishman, and the least connected with Ireland and things Irish, has a deep concern, surely, in the present temper and action of the Irish people towards England, and must be impelled to seek for the real explanation of them. We find ourselves, though conscious, as we assure one another, of nothing but goodwill to all the world—we find ourselves the object of a glowing, fierce, unexplained hatred on the part of the Irish. ‘The Liberal Ministry resolved,’ said one of our leading Liberal statesmen a few years ago, when the Irish Church Establishment was abolished, ‘the Liberal Ministry resolved to knit the hearts of the empire into one harmonious concord, and knitted they were accordingly.’ Knitted indeed! The Irish people send members to our Parliament whose great recommendation with their constituencies is, says Miss O’Brien, that they are wolves ready to fly at the throat of England; and more and more of these wolves, we are told, are likely to be sent over to us. These wolves ravin and destroy in the most savage and mortifying way; obstruct our business, lacerate our good name, deface our dignity, make our cherished fashions of government impossible and ridiculous. And then come eloquent rhetoricians, startling us with the prediction that Ireland will have either to be governed in future despotically, or to be given up. Even more alarming are certain grave and serious observers, who will not leave us even the cold comfort of the rhetoricians’ alternative, but declare that Ireland is irresistibly drifting to a separation from us, and to an unhappy separation—a separation which will bring confusion and misery to Ireland, danger to us.

For my part, I am entirely indisposed to believe the eloquent rhetoricians who tell me that Ireland must either be governed as a Crown colony or must be given up. I am entirely indisposed to

believe the despondent observers who tell me that Ireland is irresistibly drifting to a separation, and a miserable separation, from England. I no more believe the eloquent rhetoricians than I should believe them if they prophesied to me that Scotland, Wales, or Cornwall would have either to be governed as Crown colonies or to be given up. I no more believe the despondent observers than I should believe them if they assured me that Scotland, Wales, or Cornwall were irresistibly drifting to a miserable separation from England. No doubt Ireland presents many and great difficulties, and England has many and great faults and shortcomings. But after all the English people, with 'its ancient and inbred piety, integrity, good nature, and good humour,' has considerable merits and has done considerable things in the world;—in presence of such terrifying predictions and assurances as those which I have been just quoting, it becomes right and necessary to say so. I refuse to believe that such a people is unequal to the task of blending Ireland with itself in the same way that Scotland, Wales, and Cornwall are blended with us, if it sets about the task seriously.

True, there are difficulties. One of the greatest is to be found in our English habit of adopting a conventional account of things, satisfying our own minds with it, and then imagining that it will satisfy other people's minds also, and may really be relied on. Goethe, that sagest of critics, and moreover a great lover and admirer of England, noted this fault in us. 'It is good in the English,' says he, 'that they are always for being practical in their dealing with things; *aber sie sind Pedanten*'—but they are pedants. Elsewhere he attributes this want of insight in the English, their acceptance of phrase and convention and their trust in these, their pedantry in short, to the habits of their public life and to the reign amongst them of party spirit and party formulas. Burke supplies a remarkable confirmation of this account of the matter, when he complains of Parliament as being a place where it is 'the business of a Minister still further to contract the narrowness of men's ideas, to confirm inveterate prejudices, to inflame vulgar passions, and to abet all sorts of popular absurdities.' The true explanation of any matter is therefore seldom come at by us, but we rest in that account of things which it suits our class, our party, our leaders, to adopt and to render current. We are pedants, as Goethe says; we adopt a version of things because we choose, not because it really represents them; and we expect it to hold good because we wish that it may.

But, 'it is not your fond desire or mine,' says Burke again, 'that can alter the nature of things; by contending against which, what have we got, or shall ever get, but defeat and shame?' We shall solve at last, I hope and believe, the difficulty which the state of Ireland presents to us. But we shall never solve it without first understanding it; and we shall never understand it while we pedantically accept whatever accounts of it happen to pass current with our class, or party

of leaders, and to be recommended by our fond desire and theirs. We must see the matter as it really stands, we must cease to ignore, and to try to set aside, the nature of things; 'by contending against which, what have we got, or shall ever get, but defeat and shame?'

Pedantry and conventionality, therefore, are dangerous when we are in difficulties; and our habits of class and party action, and our ways of public discussion, tend to encourage pedantry and conventionality in us. Now there are insignificant people, detached from classes and parties and their great movements, unclassed and unconsidered, but who are lovers of their country, of the humane life and of civilisation, and therefore grievously distressed at the condition in which they see Ireland and Irish sentiment, and appalled at the prophecies they hear of the turn which things in Ireland must certainly take. Such persons—who after all, perhaps, are not so very few in number—may well desire to talk the case over one to another in their own quiet and simple way, without pedantry and conventionality, admitting unchallenged none of the phrases with which classes and parties are apt to settle matters, resolving to look things full in the face and let them pass for what they really are; in order that they may ascertain whether there is any chance of comfort in store, or whether things are really as black and hopeless as we are told. The editor of this Review is a kind and charitable soul, and he is willing to make room, among his statesmen and generals, for an insignificant outsider who proposes only to talk to other insignificant outsiders like himself in a plain way, and to perish in the light, at any rate (if perish we must), and not in a cloud of pedantry. But we must take the benefit of our kind editor's charity when we can, and he insists on extending it to us at this moment, when the Land Bill is not yet made known. However, it is possible that a knowledge of the Land Bill might not much help us; at all events, it is not essential to our purpose, which is to look fairly into the incompatibility, alleged to be incurable, between us and the Irish nation.

Even to talk of the people inhabiting an island quite near to us, and which we have possessed ever since the twelfth century, as a distinct nation from ourselves, ought to seem strange and absurd to us; as strange and absurd as to talk of the people inhabiting Brittany as a distinct nation from the French. However, we know but too well that the Irish consider themselves a distinct nation from us, and that some of their leaders, upon this ground, claim for them a parliament, and even an army and navy, and a diplomacy, separate and distinct from ours. And this, again, ought to seem as strange and absurd as for Scotland or Wales or Cornwall to claim a parliament, an army and navy, and a diplomacy, distinct from ours; or as for Brittany or Provence to claim a parliament, an army and navy, and a diplomacy, distinct from those of France. However, it is a fact that for Ireland such claims are made, while for Scotland, Wales,

Cornwall, Brittany, and Provence, they are not. That is because Scotland, Wales, and Cornwall are really blended in national feeling with us, and Brittany and Provence with the rest of France. And it is well that people should come to understand and feel that it is quite incumbent on a nation to have its parts blended together in a common national feeling; and that there is insecurity, and reason for mortification and humiliation, if they are not. At last this, at least, has been borne in upon the mind of the general public in England, which for a long while troubled itself not at all about the matter,—that it is a ground of insecurity to us, and a cause of mortification and humiliation, that we have so completely failed to attach Ireland. I remember when I was visiting schools in Alsace twenty years ago, I noticed a number of points in which questions of language and religion seemed to me likely to raise irritation against the French government, and to call forth in the people of Alsace the sense of their separate nationality. Yet all such irritating points were smoothed down by the power of a common national feeling with France; and we all know how deeply German and Protestant Alsace regretted, and still regrets, the loss of her connexion with France Celtic and Catholic. Undoubtedly this does great honour to French civilisation and its attractive forces. We, on the other hand, Germanic and Protestant England, we have utterly failed to attach Celtic and Catholic Ireland, although our language prevails there, and although we have no great counter-nationality on the borders of Ireland to compete with us for the possession of her affections, as the French had Germany on the borders of Alsace.

England holds Ireland, say the Irish, by means of conquest and confiscation. But almost all countries have undergone conquest and confiscation; and almost all property, if we go back far enough, has its source in these violent proceedings. People, however, go about their daily business, gradually things settle down, there is well-being and tolerable justice, prescription arises, and nobody talks about conquest and confiscation any more. The Frankish conquest of France, the Norman conquest of England, came in this way, with time, to be no longer talked of, to be no longer even thought of.

The seizure of Strasburg by France is an event belonging to modern history; it was a violent and scandalous act, but it long ago ceased to stir resentment in a single Alsatian bosom. The English conquest of Ireland took place little more than a century after the Norman conquest of England. But in Ireland it did not happen that people went about their daily business, that their condition improved, that things settled down, that the country became peaceful and prosperous, and that gradually all remembrance of conquest and confiscation died out. On the contrary, the conquest had again and again to be renewed, the sense of prescription, the true security of all property, never arose. The angry memory of conquest and confisca-

tion, the ardour for revolt against them, continued to burn, and burns still; the present relations between landlord and tenant in Ireland offer only too much proof of it.

But this is only saying over again that England has failed to attach Ireland. We must ask, then, what it is which makes things, after a conquest, settle peaceably down, what makes a sense of prescription arise, what makes property secure and blends the conquered people into one nation with the conquered. Certainly we must put, as the first and chief causes, general well-being, and justice. Never mind how misery arises, whether by the fault of the conquered or by the fault of the conqueror, its very existence prevents the solid settlement of things, prevents the dying out of desires for revolt and change. Now let us consult the testimonies from Elizabeth's reign, when the middle age had ended and the modern age had begun, down to the present time. First we have this picture of Irish misery by the poet Spenser:—

Out of every corner of the woods and glens they came creeping forth upon their hands, for their legs could not bear them; they looked like anatomies of death, they spake like ghosts crying out of their graves; they did eat the dead carrions, happy where they could find them, yea, and one another soon after, insomuch as the very carcases they spared not to scrape out of their graves; and if they found a plot of water-cresses or shamrocks there, they flocked as to a feast for the time, yet not able long to continue these withal; that in short space there were none almost left.

Then, a hundred and forty years later, we have another picture of Irish misery, a picture drawn by the terrible hand of Swift. He describes 'the miserable dress and diet and dwelling of the people, the general desolation in most parts of the kingdom.' He says:—

Some persons of a desponding spirit are in great concern about the aged, diseased, or maimed poor; but I am not in the least pain upon that matter, because it is very well known that they are every day dying and rotting by cold and famine, and filth and vermin, as fast as can be reasonably expected.

And again:—

I confess myself to be touched with a very sensible pleasure when I hear of a mortality in any country parish or village, where the wretches are forced to pay, for a filthy cabin and two ridges of potatoes, treble the worth; brought up to steal or beg, for want of work; to whom death would be the best thing to be wished for, on account both of themselves and the public.

Next, after the lapse of a hundred and fifty years more, coming down to our own day, we have this sentence, strong and short, from Colonel Gordon:—

The state of our fellow-countrymen in the south-west of Ireland is worse than that of any people in the world—let alone Europe.

I say, where there is this misery going on for centuries after a conquest, acquiescence in the conquest cannot take place; a sense of permanent settlement and of the possessors' prescriptive title to their

property cannot spring up, the conquered cannot blend themselves into one nation with their conquerors. English opinion attributes Irish misery to the faults of the Irish themselves, to their insubordination, to their idleness and improvidence, and to their Popish religion. However the misery arises, there cannot, as I have already said, be fusion and forgetfulness of past violences and confiscations while it lasts. Still, if it is due to the faults of the Irish, it is in curing faults on their side that we have to seek the remedy, not in curing faults of our own.

Undoubtedly the native Irish have the faults which we attribute to them and a good many more besides. Undoubtedly those Anglo-Irish, who lead them, too often superadd to the passionate unreason of the natives our own domestic hardness and narrow doggedness, and it makes a very unpleasant mixture. Undoubtedly it is not agreeable to have people offering to fly like wolves at your throat—these people knowing, at the same time, that you will not put out your full strength against them, and covering you on that account with all the more menace and contumely. England must often enough be disposed to answer such assailants gruffly, to vow that she will silence them once for all, and to ejaculate, as Cæsar did when he threatened to silence the tribune Metellus: ‘And when I say this, young man, to say it is more trouble to me than to do it.’ Were there ever people, indeed, who so aggravated their own difficulties as the Irish people, so increased the labour and sorrow of him who toils to find a remedy for them? ‘Always ready to react against the despotism of fact,’—so their best friend among their French kinsmen describes them. ‘Poor brainsick creatures!’—a sterner critic among these kinsmen says—‘poor brainsick creatures, distraught with misery and incurable ignorance! by inflaming themselves against the English connexion, by refusing to blend their blood, their habits, their hopes, with those of the leading country, they are preparing for themselves a more miserable future than that of any other people in Europe.’ It seems as if this poor Celtic people were bent on making what one of its own poets has said of its heroes, hold good for ever: ‘They went forth to the war, *but they always fell.*’

All this may be very true; but still we ought to know whether the faults and misery of the Irish are due solely to themselves, and all we can do is to hold down the poor brainsick creatures and punish them—which, to say the truth, we have done freely enough in the past; or whether their state is due, in whole or in large part, to courses followed by ourselves, and not even yet discontinued by us altogether, in which it may be possible to make a change.

Now, I imagine myself to be at present talking quietly to open-minded, unprejudiced, simple people, free from class spirit and party spirit, resolved to forswear self-delusion and make-believe, not to be pedants, but to see things as they really are. Such people will be

most anxious, as I too was anxious, on this question of the rights and wrongs of England's dealings with Ireland, to put themselves in good hands; and if they find a guide whom they can thoroughly trust, they will not be restive or perverse with him; they will admit his authority frankly. Burke is here a guide whom we can thus trust. He is the greatest of English statesmen—the only one, it seems to me, who traces the reason of things in politics, and who enables us to trace it too. Compared with him, Fox is a brilliant and generous schoolboy, and Pitt is a schoolboy with a gift (such as even at school not unfrequently comes out) for direction and government. Burke was, moreover, a great Conservative statesman—Conservative in the best sense. On the French Revolution his utterances are not entirely those of the Burke of the best time, of the Burke of the American War. He was abundantly wise in condemning the crudity and tyrannousness of the revolutionary spirit; still, there has to be added to Burke's picture of the Revolution a side which he does not furnish; we ought to supplement him as we read him, and sometimes to correct him. But on Ireland, which he knew thoroughly, he was always the Burke of the best time; he never varied; his hatred of Jacobinism did not here make him go back one hair's breadth. 'I am of the same opinion,' he writes in 1797, the year in which he died, 'to my last breath, which I entertained when my faculties were at the best.' Mr. John Morley's admirable biography has interested all of us afresh in Burke's life and genius; the Irish questions which now press upon us should make us seek out and read every essay, letter, and speech of Burke on the subject of Ireland.

Burke is clear in the opinion that down to the end of his life, at any rate, Irish misery and discontent have been due more to English misgovernment than to Irish faults. 'We found the people heretics and idolaters,' he says; 'we have, by way of improving their condition, rendered them slaves and beggars; they remain in all the misfortune of their old errors, and all the superadded misery of their recent punishment.' It is often alleged in England that the repeated confiscations of Irish lands, and even the Popery Laws themselves, were necessitated by the rebelliousness and intractableness of the Irish themselves; the country could only be held down for England by a Protestant garrison, and through these severe means. Burke dissipates this flattering illusion. Even the Penal Code itself, he says, even 'the laws of that unparalleled code of oppression, were manifestly the effects of national hatred and scorn towards a conquered people, whom the victors delighted to trample upon, and were not at all afraid to provoke. *They were not the effect of their fears, but of their security.* They who carried on this system looked to the irresistible force of Great Britain for their support in their acts of power. They were quite certain that no complaints of the natives would be heard on this side of the water with any other sentiments than those of contempt and

indignation. In England, the double name of the complainant, Irish and Papist (it would be hard to say which singly was the most odious), shut up the hearts of every one against them. They were looked upon as a race of bigoted savages, who were a disgrace to human nature itself.'

And therefore, although Burke declared that 'hitherto the plan for the government of Ireland has been to sacrifice the civil prosperity of the nation to its religious improvement,' yet he declared, also, that 'it is injustice, and not a mistaken conscience, that has been the principle of persecution.' That 'melancholy and invidious title,' he says, 'the melancholy and unpleasant title of grantees of confiscation, is a favourite.' The grantees do not even wish 'to let Time draw his oblivious veil over the unpleasant modes by which lordships and demesnes have been acquired in theirs and almost in all other countries upon earth.' On the contrary, 'they inform the public of Europe that their estates are made up of forfeitures and confiscations from the natives. They abandon all pretext of the general good of the community.' The Popery Laws were but part of a system for enabling the grantees of confiscation to hold Ireland without blending with the natives or reconciling them. The object of those laws, and their effect, was 'to reduce the Catholics of Ireland to a miserable populace, without property, without estimation, without education. They divided the nation into two distinct bodies, without common interest, sympathy, or connexion. One of these branches was to possess *all* the franchises, *all* the property, *all* the education; the other was to be composed of drawers of water and cutters of turf for them.'

In short, the mass of the Irish people were kept without well-being and without justice. Well might Burke adjure all concerned to 'reflect upon the possible consequences of keeping, in the heart of your country, a bank of discontent every hour accumulating, upon which every description of seditious men may draw at pleasure.' Well might he austere answer that Bristol Philistine who remonstrated with them against making concessions to the Irish: 'Sir, it is proper to inform you that our measures *must be healing*.' Well might he add, 'Their temper, too, must be managed, and their good affections cultivated.' Burke hated Jacobinism, the angry and premature destruction of the existing order of things, even more than he hated Protestant ascendancy; but this, he remarked, led straight to the other. 'If men are kept as being no better than half citizens for any length of time, they will be made whole Jacobins.'

In 1797 this great man died, without having convinced Parliament or the nation of truths which he himself saw so clearly, and had seen all his life. In his very last years, while he was hailed as the grand defender of thrones and altars, while George the Third thanked him for his *Reflections on the French Revolution*, and while the

¹ The italics are Burke's own.

book was lying on the table of every great house and every parsonage in England, he writes that as regards Ireland he is absolutely without influence, and that if any Irish official were known to share his views he would probably be dismissed. What an illustration of the truth of Goethe's criticism on us: 'Their Parliamentary parties are great opposing forces which paralyse one another, and where the superior insight of an individual can hardly break through!'

Burke died three years before the Union. He left behind him two warnings, both of them full of truth, full of gravity. One is that concessions, sufficient if given in good time and at a particular conjuncture of events, become insufficient if deferred. The other is that concessions, extorted from embarrassment and fear, produce no gratitude, and allay no resentment. 'God forbid,' he cries, 'that our conduct should demonstrate to the world that Great Britain can in no instance whatsoever be brought to a sense of rational and equitable policy, but by coercion and force of arms.'

Burke thought, as every sane man must think, 'connexion between Great Britain and Ireland essential to the welfare of both.' He was for a Union. But he doubted whether the particular time of the closing years of the last century was favourable for a Union. Mr. Lecky, in his delightful book, *The Leaders of Public Opinion in Ireland*, expresses a like doubt. The restrictions on Irish trade had given to the Anglo-Irish and to the native Irish a joint interest adverse to Great Britain; they had acted together on behalf of Irish independence; the beginnings of a common national feeling between them had sprung up. The Catholics had been admitted to vote for members of Parliament, and it seemed likely that they would soon be declared capable of sitting in Parliament. The Union came, and imported into the settlement of that matter a new personage, the British Philistine. For thirty years this personage, of whose ideas George the Third was the faithful mouth-piece, delayed Catholic emancipation. Wesley wrote, Mr. Lecky tells us, against the withdrawal of the penal laws. 'At last, in 1829, the disabilities of Catholics were taken off,—but in dread of an insurrection. A wise man might at that moment well have recalled Burke's two warnings. What was done in 1829 could not have the sufficiency which in 1800 it might have had; what was yielded in dread of insurrection could not produce gratitude.'

Meanwhile Irish misery went on; there were loud complaints of the 'grantees of confiscation,' the landlords. Ministers replied, that the conduct of many landlords was deplorable, and that absenteeism was a great evil, but that nothing could be done against them, and that the sufferers must put their hopes in 'general sympathy.' The people pullulated in the warm steam of their misery; famine and Fenianism appeared. Great further concessions have since been made—the abolition of tithes, the abolition of the Irish Church Establishment,

the Land Act of 1870—but with respect to every one of them Burke's warnings hold good; they were given too late to produce the effect which they might have produced earlier, and they seemed to be given not from a desire to do justice, but from the apprehension of danger. Finally, we have to-day in parts of Ireland the misery to which Colonel Gordon bears witness; we have the wide-spread agitation respecting the land; we have the Irish people, if not yet 'whole Jacobins,' as Burke said we were making them, at least in a fair way to become so. And to meet these things we have coercion and the promised Land Bill.

For my part, I do not object, wherever I see disorder, to see coercion applied to it. And in Ireland there has been, and there is, much disorder. I do not agree with the orators of popular meetings, and I do not agree with some Liberals with whom I agree in general, I do not agree with them in objecting to apply coercion to Irish disorder, or to any other. Tumultuously doing what one likes is the ideal of the populace; it is not mine. True, concessions have often been wrung from governments only by the fear of tumults and disturbances, but it is an unsafe way of winning them, and concessions so won, as Burke has shown us, are never lucky. Unswerving firmness in repressing disorder is always a government's duty; so, too, is unswerving firmness in redressing injustice. It will be said that we have often governments firm enough in repressing disorder, who, after repressing it, leave injustice still unredressed. True; but it is our business to train ourselves, and to train public opinion, to make governments do otherwise; not to make governments irresolute in repressing disorder, but to make them resolute, also, in redressing injustice.

'Sir, it is proper to inform you that our measures *must be healing*.' We do not yet know what the new Land Bill will be. But we have the Land Act of 1870 before our eyes, and we are told that proceeding a good deal further upon the lines of that Act is what is intended. Will this be *healing*?—that is the question. I confess that if one has no class or party interests to warp one, and if one is resolved not to be a pedant but to look at things simply and naturally, it seems impossible to think so.

The truth is, as every one who is honest with himself must perceive—the truth is, what is most needed, in dealing with the land in Ireland, is not to confer boons on all tenants, but to execute justice on bad landlords. Property is sacred, will be the instant reply; the landlords, bad or good, have prescription in their favour. Property is sacred when it has prescription in its favour; but the very point is, that in Ireland prescription has never properly arisen. There has been such lack of well-being and justice there, that things have never passed—at least they have never throughout the length and breadth of Ireland passed—out of their first violent, confiscatory stage.

‘I shall never praise either confiscations or counter-confiscations,’ says Burke. A wise man will not approve the violences of a time of confiscation, but if things settle down, he would never think of proposing counter-confiscation as an atonement for these violences. It is far better that things should settle down and that the past should be forgotten. But here things have not settled down, and the harshness, vices, and neglect of many of the grantees of confiscation have been the main cause why they have not. ‘The law bears, and must bear, with the vices and follies of men, until they actually strike at the root of order.’ In general, the vices and follies of individual owners of property are borne with because they are scattered, single cases, and do not strike at the root of order. In Ireland, they represent a system which has made peace and prosperity impossible, and which strikes at the root of order. Some good landlords there always were in Ireland; as a class they are said to be now good; certainly there are some who are excellent. But there are not a few, also, who are still very bad; and these keep alive in the Irish people the memory of old wrong, represent and continue, to the Irish mind, the old system. A government, by executing justice upon them, declares that it breaks with that system, and founds a state of things in which the good owners of property, now endangered along with the bad, will be safe, in which a real sense of prescription can take root, general well-being, that necessary condition precedent of Ireland’s cheerful acquiescence in the English connexion, may become possible, and the country can settle down. Such a measure would be a truly Conservative one, and every landowner who does his duty would find his security in it and ought to wish for it. A Commission should draw up a list of offenders, and an Act of Parliament should expropriate them without scruple.

English landowners start with horror at such a proposal; but the truth is, in considering these questions of property and land, *they are pedants*. They look without horror on the expropriation of the monastic orders by Henry the Eighth’s Parliament, and many of them are at this day great gainers by that transaction. Yet there is no reason at all why expropriating religious corporations, to give their lands to individuals, should not shock a man, but expropriating individual owners, to sell their lands in such manner as the State may think advisable, should shock him so greatly. The estates of religious corporations, as such, are not, says the conservative Burke, severely but truly, ‘in worse hands than estates to the like amount in the hands of this earl or that squire, although it may be true that so many dogs and horses are not kept by the religious.’ But it was alleged that many monastic establishments, by their irregularities and vices, were a cause of public harm, struck at the root of order. The same thing may most certainly be said of too many Irish landlords at this day, with their harshness, vices, and neglect of duty. Reason of

State may be alleged for dealing with both. In the mode of dealing there can be no parallel. The monks were expropriated wholesale, good as well as bad, with little or no compensation ; of the landlords it is proposed to expropriate only the worst, so as to found for the good ones security and prescription ; and the compensation assigned to the bad expropriated landlords by the English Parliament is sure to be not insufficient, rather it will be too ample.

For the confiscations of the lands of the native Irish themselves, from Elizabeth's time downwards, the plea of justification has been this : the reason of State, the plea that the faults of the Irish possessor 'struck at the root of order.' The confiscations were continuous and severe ; they were carried on both by armed force and by legal chicane ; they were in excess of what the reason of State, even at the time, seemed to fair men to require. 'By English Acts of Parliament,' says Burke, 'forced upon two reluctant kings, the lands of Ireland were put up to a mean and scandalous auction in every goldsmith's shop in London ; or chopped to pieces and cut into rations, to pay the soldiery of Cromwell.' However, the justification was this, as I have said : the reason of State. The faults of the Irish possessor struck at the root of order. And if order and happiness had arisen under the new possessors, not a word more would ever have been heard about past confiscations. But order and happiness have not arisen under them ; a great part of the Irish people is in a chronic state of misery, discontent, and smouldering insurrection. To reconquer and chastise them is easy ; but after you have chastised them, your eternal difficulty with them recommences. I pass by the suggestion that the Irish people should be entirely extirpated ; no one can make it seriously. They must be brought to acquiescence in the English connexion by good treatment. The acquiescence has been prevented by the vices, harshness, and neglect of the grantees of confiscation ; and it never will arise, so long as there are many of these who prevent it by their vices, harshness, and neglect still. Order will never strike root. The very same reason of State holds good, therefore, for expropriating them, which held good in their predecessors' eyes, and in the eyes of English Parliaments, for expropriating the native Irish possessors.

However, the expropriation of English or Anglo-Irish landlords is a thing from which English ministers will always avert their thoughts as long as they can, and another remedy for Irish discontent has been hit upon. It has been suggested, as every one knows, by the Ulster custom. In Ireland, the landlord has not been in the habit of doing for his farms what a landlord does for his farms in England ; and this, too, undoubtedly sprang out of the old system of rule on the part of the grantees of confiscation as if they were lords and masters simply, and not men having a joint interest with the tenant. 'In Ireland,' says Burke, 'the farms have neither dwelling-houses nor good offices ; nor are the lands almost anywhere provided with fences

and communications. The landowner there never takes upon him, as it is usual in this kingdom, to supply all these conveniences, and to set down his tenant in what may be called a completely furnished farm. If the tenant will not do it, it is never done.' And if the tenant did it, what was done was still the property of the landlord, and the tenant lost the benefit of it by losing his farm. But in Ulster, where the tenants were a strong race and Protestants, there arose a custom of compensating them for their improvements, and letting them sell the value which by their improvements they had added to the property. But a bad landlord could set the custom at defiance; so the Land Act of 1870 regulated the custom, and gave the force of law to what had before possessed the force of custom only. And many people think that what ministers intend, is to develop considerably the principles and provisions of that Act—so considerably, indeed, as to guarantee to the tenants fair rents, fixity of tenure, and free sale; and to extend the operation of the Act, so developed, to the whole of Ireland.

The new Bill is not before us, and I speak besides, as I perfectly well know and frankly avow, without special, local knowledge of Irish affairs. But a scheme such as that which has been indicated has inconveniences which are manifest, surely, to every one who uses his common sense, and is not hindered from using it freely by the obligation not to do what would be really effective, but still to do something. It is evident that ownership and tenure will thus be made quite a different thing in Ireland from that which they are in England, and in countries of our sort of civilisation generally, and this is surely a disadvantage. It is surely well to have plain deep common marks recognised everywhere, at least in all countries possessing a common civilisation, as characterising ownership and as characterising tenancy, and to introduce as little of novel and fanciful complication here as possible. Above all this is desirable, one would think, with a people like the Irish, sanguine and imaginative, who, if they are told that tenancy means with them more than it means elsewhere, will be prone to make it mean yet more than you intend. It is surely a disadvantage, again, to put a formal compulsion on good landlords to do what they were accustomed to do willingly, and to deprive them of all freedom and credit in the transaction. And the bad landlord, the real creator of our difficulties, remains on the spot still, but partially tied and entirely irritated; it will be strange indeed, if plenty of occasions of war do not still arise between him and his tenant, and prevent the growth of a sense of reconciliation, pacification, and prescription.

Landowners hate parting with their land, it is true; but it may be doubted whether for the landlord to assign a portion of land in absolute property to the tenant, in recompense for the improvements hitherto effected, and in future himself to undertake necessary improvements, as an English landlord does, would not be a better, safer,

and more pacifying solution of tenant-right claims, than either the Act of 1870, or any Act proceeding upon the lines there laid down.

However, there are many people who put their faith in the Land Act of 1870, properly developed, and extended to the whole of Ireland. Other people, again, put their faith in emigration, as the means of relieving the distressed districts, and that, they say, is all that is wanted. And if these remedies, either the Land Act singly, or emigration singly, or both of them together, prove to be sufficient, there is not a word more to be said. If Ireland settles down, if its present state of smothered revolt ceases, if misery goes out and well-being comes in, if a sense of the prescriptive right of the legal owner of land springs up, and a sense of acquiescence in the English connexion, there is not a word more to be said. What abstracted people may devise in their study, or may say in their little companies when they come together, will not be regarded. Attention it will then, indeed, not require, and it is never easy to procure attention for it, even when it requires attention. English people live in classes and parties, English statesmen think of classes and parties in whatever they do. Burke himself, as I have said, on this question of Ireland which he had so made his own, Burke at the height of his fame, when men went to consult him, we are told, 'as an oracle of God,' Burke himself, detached from party and class, had no influence in directing matters, could effect nothing. 'You have formed,' he writes to a friend in Ireland who was unwilling to believe this, 'you have formed to my person a flattering, yet in truth a very erroneous opinion of my power with those who direct the public measures. I never have been directly or indirectly consulted about anything that is done.'

No, *the English are pedants*, and will proceed in the ways of pedantry as long as they possibly can. They will not ask themselves what really meets the wants of a case, but they will ask what may be done without offending the prejudices of their classes and parties, and then they will agree to say to one another and to the world that this is what really meets the wants of the case, and that it is the only thing to be done. And ministers will always be prone to avoid facing difficulty seriously, and yet to do something and to put the best colour possible on that something; and so 'still further to contract,' as Burke says, 'the narrowness of men's ideas, to confirm inveterate prejudices, and to abet all sorts of popular absurdities.' But if a Land Act on the lines of that of 1870 fails to appease Ireland, or if emigration fails to prove a sufficient remedy, then quiet people who have accustomed themselves to consider the thing without pedantry and prejudice, may have the consolation of knowing that there is still something in reserve, still a resource which has not been tried, and which may be tried and succeed. Not only do we not exceed our duty towards Ireland in trying this resource, if necessary, but, until we try it, we have not even gone to the extent of our duty.

And when rhetoricians who seek to startle us, or despondent persons who seek to lighten their despondency by making us share it with them, when these come and tell us that in regard to Ireland we have only a choice between two desperate alternatives before us, or that we have nothing before us except ruin and confusion, then simple people, who have divested themselves of pedantry, may answer: 'You forget that there is one remedy which you have never mentioned, and apparently never thought of. It has not occurred to you to try breaking visibly, and by a striking and solemn act, the expropriation of bad landlords, with your evil and oppressive past in Ireland. Perhaps your other remedies may succeed if you add this remedy to them, though without it they cannot.' And surely we insignificant people in our retirement may solace our minds with the imagination of right-minded and equitable Englishmen, men like the Lord Chief Justice of England, and Mr. Samuel Morley, and others whom one could easily name, acting as a Commission to draw up a list of the thoroughly bad landlords, representatives of the old evil system, and then bringing their list to London and saying: 'Expropriate these, as the monks were expropriated, by Act of Parliament.' And since nothing is so exasperating as pedantry when people are in serious troubles, it may console the poor Irish, too, when official personages insist on assuring them that certain insufficient remedies are sufficient, and are also the only remedies possible, it may console them to know, that there are a number of quiet people over here who feel that this sort of thing is pedantry and make-believe, and who dislike and distrust our common use of it, and think it dangerous. These quiet people know that it must go on being used for a long time yet, but they condemn and disown it; and they do their best to prepare opinion for banishing it.

But the truth is, in regard to Ireland, the prejudices of our two most influential classes, the upper class and the middle class, tend always to make a compromise together, and to be tender to one another's weaknesses; and this is unfortunate for Ireland. It prevents the truth, on the two matters where English wrong-doing has been deepest—the land and religion—from being ever strongly spoken out and fairly acted upon, even by those who might naturally be expected to have done so. The English middle class, who have not the prejudices and passions of a landowning class, might have been expected to sympathise with the Irish in their ill-usage by the grantees of confiscation, and to interfere in order to relieve them from it. The English upper class, who have not the prejudices and passions of our middle class, might have been expected to sympathise with the Irish in the ill-treatment of their religion, and to interfere to relieve them from it. But nothing clouds men's minds and impairs their honesty like prejudice. Each class forbears to touch the other's prejudice too roughly, for fear of provoking a like rough treatment of its own. Our aristo-

cratic class does not firmly protest against the unfair treatment of Irish Catholicism because it is nervous about the land; our middle class does not firmly insist on breaking with the old evil system of Irish landlordism because it is nervous about Popery.

And even if the middle class were to insist on doing right with the land, it would be of no use, it would not reconcile Ireland, unless they can also be brought to do right with religion. It is very important to keep this in full view. The land question is the question of the moment. Liberals are fond of saying that Mr. Gladstone's concessions will remove Irish discontent; even the *Pall Mall Gazette*, the most serious and clear-minded of the exponents of Liberal ideas talks as if a good Land Bill would settle everything. It will not; and it is deceiving ourselves to hope that it will. The thing is to bring Ireland to acquiesce cordially in the English connexion. This can be done only by doing perfect justice to Ireland, not in one particular matter only, but in all the matters where she has suffered great wrong. Miss O'Brien quotes an excellent saying of Fox's: 'We ought not to presume to legislate for a nation in whose feelings and affections, wants and interests, opinions and prejudices, we have no sympathy.' It is most true; and it is of general application. Mr. Bright is said to be desirous of dealing thoroughly with the Irish Land Question. With the wants and interests of the Irish people in this matter, even with their feelings and affections, opinions and prejudices, he is capable of sympathy. But how as to their wants and interests, feelings and affections, opinions and prejudices, in the matter of their religion? When they ask to have their Catholicism treated as Anglicanism is treated in England, and Presbyterianism is treated in Scotland, is Mr. Bright capable of sympathy with them? If he is, would he venture to show it if they made their request? I think one may pretty well anticipate what would happen. Mr. Carvell Williams would begin to stir, Mr. Jesse Collings would trot out that spavined, vicious-eyed Liberal hobby, expressly bred to do duty against the Irish Catholics: *The Liberal party has emphatically condemned religious endowment*;—and I greatly fear that Mr. Bright would pat it approvingly.

'Sir, it is proper to inform you, that our measures *must be healing*.' Who but a pedant could imagine that our disestablishment of the Irish Church was a satisfaction of the equitable claims of Irish Catholicism upon us? that it was *healing*? 'By this policy, in 1868, the Liberal Ministry resolved to knit the hearts of the empire into one harmonious concord; and knitted they were accordingly.' Parliament and public of pedants! they were nothing of the kind, and you know it. Ministers could disestablish the Irish Church because there was among the Nonconformists of England and Scotland an antipathy to religious establishments; but justice to Irish Catholicism, and equal treatment with Anglicanism in England

and Presbyterianism in Scotland, they could not give, because of the bigotry of the English and Scotch of the middle class. Do you suppose that the Irish Catholics feel any particular gratitude to a Liberal Ministry for gratifying its Nonconformist supporters, and giving itself the air of achieving 'a grand and genial policy of conciliation,' without doing them real justice? They do not, and cannot; and your measure was not healing. I think I was the only person who said so, in print at any rate, at the time. Plenty of people saw it, but *the English are pedants*, and they thought that if we all agreed to call what we had done 'a grand and genial policy of conciliation,' perhaps it would pass for being so. But 'it is not your fond desire nor mine that can alter the nature of things.' At present I hear on all sides that the Irish Catholics, who, to do them justice, are quick enough, see our 'grand and genial' act of 1868 in simply its true light, and are not grateful for it in the least.

Do I say that a Liberal Ministry could, in 1868, have done justice to Irish Catholicism, or that it could do justice to it now? 'Go to the Surrey Tabernacle,' say my Liberal friends to me; 'regard that forest of firm, serious, unintelligent faces uplifted towards Mr. Spurgeon, and then ask yourself what would be the effect produced on all that force of hard and narrow prejudice by a proposal of Mr. Gladstone to pay the Catholic priests in Ireland, or to give them money for their houses and churches, or to establish schools and universities suited to Catholics, as England has public schools and universities suited to Anglicans, and Scotland such as are suited to Presbyterians. What would be Mr. Gladstone's chance of carrying such a measure?' I know quite well, of course, that he would have no chance at all of carrying it. But the English people are improvable, I hope. Slowly this powerful race works its way out of its confining ruts, and its clouded vision of things, to the manifestation of those great qualities which it has at bottom—piety, integrity, good-nature, and good-humour. Our serious middle class, which has so turned a religion full of grace and truth into a religion full of hardness and misapprehension, is not doomed to lie in its present dark obstruction for ever, it is improvable. And we insignificant quiet people, as we had our consolation from perceiving what might yet be done about the land, when rhetoricians were startling us out of our senses, and despondent persons were telling us that there was no hope left, so we have our consolation, too, from perceiving what may yet be done about Catholicism. There is still something in reserve, still a resource which we have not yet tried, and which classes and parties amongst us have agreed never to mention, but which in quiet circles, where pedantry is laid aside and things are allowed to be what they are, presents itself to our minds and is a great comfort to us. And the Irish too, when they are exasperated by the pedantry and unreality of the agreement, in England, to pass

off as 'a great and genial policy of conciliation' what is nothing of the kind, may be more patient if they know that there is an increasing number of persons over here who abhor this make-believe and try to explode it, though keeping quite in the background at present, and seeking to work on men's minds quietly rather than to bustle in Parliament and at public meetings.

Before, then, we adopt the tremendous alternative of either governing Ireland as a Crown colony or casting her adrift, before we afflict ourselves with the despairing thought that Ireland is going inevitably to confusion and ruin, there is still something left for us. As we pleased ourselves with the imagination of Lord Coleridge and Mr. Samuel Morley, and other like men of truth and equity, going as a Commission to Ireland, and enabling us to break with the old evil system as to the land by expropriating the worst landlords, and as we were comforted by thinking that though this might be out of the question at present, yet perhaps, if everything else failed, it might be tried and succeed,—so we may do in regard to Catholicism. We may please ourselves with the imagination of Lord Coleridge and the other Mr. Morley, Mr. John Morley, and men of like freedom with them from bigotry and prejudice, going as a Commission to Ireland, and putting us in the right way to do justice to the religion of the mass of the Irish people, and to make amends for our abominable treatment of it under the long reign of the Penal Code—a treatment much worse than Louis the Fourteenth's treatment of French Protestantism, and maintained without scruple by our religious people, while they were invoking the vengeance of heaven on Louis the Fourteenth, and turning up their eyes in anguish at the ill-usage of the distant negro. And here, too, though to carry a measure really *healing* may be out of the question at present, yet perhaps, if everything else fails, such a measure may at last be tried and succeed.

But it is not yet enough, even that our measures should be healing; 'the temper, too, of the Irish must be managed, and their good affections cultivated.' If we want to bring them to acquiesce cordially in the English connexion, it is not enough to make well-being general and to do justice, we and our civilisation must also be attractive to them. And this opens a great question, on which I must say something hereafter. For the present I have said enough. When a good-natured editor, with all kinds of potentates pressing to speak in his Review, allows an insignificant to talk to insignificants, one should not abuse his kindness.

MATTHEW ARNOLD.

BUSINESS IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

IN the November number of this Review I took the liberty of drawing the attention of its readers to the extremely critical state of affairs with regard to the transaction of business in Parliament. I tried to point out that the art of wasting time was become a kind of profession, and that no time was to be lost if that assembly, on whose wisdom and foresight everything depends, was to be saved from inevitable decline and disgrace. I do not think that any one took the trouble to reply to me; I was unanswered and unheeded. Every one must, one would think, have foreseen the inevitable attempt to defeat the Irish Coercion Bill, but nobody seemed to think the matter worth a thought. I confess that I fully expected that before entering on the discussion of such a measure the Government would have taken some pains to place the House on a level with the other states of Europe and America; and would not have rushed into an ignoble and hopeless quarrel, from which they had nothing to expect but defeat. I was not at all surprised to see that the whole of the month of January was wasted, without any perceptible progress being made: the result appeared to me perfectly certain beforehand. All the methods which the ingenuity of every country but our own has devised to check the practice of speaking against time lay before the Government, they had nothing to do but to take their choice; they did choose at last, and, as it seems to me, they chose very unfortunately. They had recourse to the last and worst resource of a defeated and dispirited party—that is, a despotism—resting on what was sure to prove, and has actually proved, a vain hope, that they could avoid the delays which the introduction of new rules and the passing them though the House were sure to involve, the Government hit upon what I must consider the unhappy device of establishing two states, one of quiet and one of emergency, leaving the latter to be ruled by laws which the Speaker alone was authorised to make, without even consulting Parliament, and for which he alone was responsible. Let us look at this proceeding from a legal point of view. There is no doubt that the House of Commons possesses the power to make laws for its own guidance, for the power has been freely executed for six centuries; it is surely a very bold, nay, I will say a very rash, experiment, to tamper with constitutional arrangements of such elaborate

completeness and such venerable antiquity. The right of regulating its own proceedings is undoubtedly in the House of Commons, but, where are we to find the right to delegate this right to another body, or to a single person? Can any case be imagined to which the maxim *Delegatus non potest delegare* could be more properly applied than the case where a great and ancient assembly breaks through the practice and traditions of many centuries in order to strip itself of one of its noblest prerogatives, the right of regulating its own proceedings, in favour of a single man who is to issue these laws without being obliged to consult any one as an alternative to the existing law; for whose laws no one but himself is responsible, and for the revocation of whose laws or their correction, as far as I can see, no provision whatever is made?

An old proverb says that it is a miserable servitude where law is vague or uncertain. Look at the state to which the House of Commons has reduced itself! It has two laws, and can never be certain under which it has to live. Most men find it hard enough to make themselves acquainted with one law, but it is hard indeed to have to reckon with two, and not two running side by side, like law and equity, but one at the shortest notice and for the most inconceivable reasons superseded by the other. We have been accustomed in times of emergency to submit to certain restrictions on our liberty, which vanished in easier times; but to find ourselves in time of peace living under two laws alternately is a trial which I believe no nation except ourselves has ever been called upon to endure, much less has imposed on itself.

We are really practising a course of proceeding—allowance being made for the difference of manners and institutions—not unlike the course adopted by the Romans when the Consul was directed to take care that the city should receive no damage; and just as this violent invasion of the law paved the way for the ruin of the Republic, so these newly instituted invasions of the law and practice of Parliament have an obvious tendency to weaken and shatter our ancient constitution, and to rend the House of Commons, on which our liberties rest, into disorderly fragments, instead of welding this great assembly into one harmonious and compact whole. It is the nature of all great assemblies to split and subdivide themselves into factions. Which is the better citizen—he who bears with patience the evils of the Commonwealth and seeks for remedies within the Constitution, or he who, unable to endure with patience the checks and disappointments of public life, seeks to indemnify himself for his mortification by violent measures, which tear up old landmarks, and are the usual forerunners of further and worse change? It is hard to prove a negative, but I believe you may ransack the history of England since the Conquest without finding anything like a precedent for the recent proceedings in the House of Commons. War and treason and violence you will find in abundance, but a deliberate act, by which any community of free Englishmen

surrendered to a single man the power of making laws for their guidance—for such an act, I believe, you will search the annals of England in vain. It may be said, and said with perfect truth, that the present Speaker of the House of Commons is the very last man by whom these enormous and hitherto unheard-of powers would be likely to be abused. I grant it freely; but this only shows the height from which we have fallen, when we are reduced to place our confidence, not in the manly instincts of a free self-governed people, but in the moderation and patriotism of a single man, to whom we have entrusted what ought never to have passed out of our own hands. It is so much easier to confide in a single man than to frame and carry a law, that the experiment of appointing a dictator has been a favourite in all ages, but in England at least it has never found favour until now. The tendency by which such violent steps are dictated is a very natural one. It offers an escape from a situation of great embarrassment and difficulty; if it succeeds, those who framed it take the lion's share of the credit, and, if it fail, the dictator is always there to bear the blame which ought to be awarded to those who trust to men rather than to measures to cure the disorders of the State.

The evil of the course is, as it seems to me, the more to be deplored, because, except from the returning wisdom of Parliament itself, it seems to be entirely without a remedy. Even supposing, as I think, that the maxim *Delegatus non potest delegare* applies, and the House of Commons has no more right to delegate its powers of making the law for its own guidance than it would have to transfer its legislative powers to the mayor and aldermen of London, where is the court, where is the tribunal, before which such an issue can be tried? The House has always claimed and maintained that it is the only judge of its own practice and proceeding, and I apprehend that it is perfectly clear that there is no jurisdiction known to our law which would presume to interfere with what has been done. If what is done is wrong, it is, I believe, absolutely without remedy, except from the wisdom of Parliament itself.

I confess I am not without a strong feeling of impatience, or even of shame, when I read that the House of Commons has been invited to declare a state of urgency. It is an evil period in the history of States when they come to use great words for small things. Great emergencies may fairly call upon us to do things from which in calmer moments we should shrink; but who could suppose that no simpler method for checking the ignoble art of talking against time could be found than that of splitting the business of the House into two, and making a distinction of the most arbitrary and illogical nature, under which the rules to be applied depend, not on the importance of the subject, but on the importunity of the orators? It seems to me very difficult to imagine a more vicious system than

the one now proposed and adopted: the tendency obviously is to apportion the time of the House between two classes of persons, those who bring forward the measures of the Government, and those who employ their time in obstructing and opposing them. Between these two classes the best men of the House will be, as happens at present, effectually shut out. It was a most unhappy thought to institute two different methods of procedure, not only because of the confusion which the existence of two sets of rules on the same subject-matter must inevitably introduce, but on account of the alternate tension and relaxation which the change from one to the other must perpetually create. All difficulties and mistakes will be borne with less patience when it is remembered that they are not in the nature of things but exist in the House's own creation: it is not in human nature that members should work two opposite systems in the same spirit, and the equality and fairness of the old system will contrast very favourably with the harsh dictatorial and unequal spirit of the new.

Where there has been considerable tension there will be a corresponding relaxation, and it may very probably be found that the remissness of one period is a natural sequel to the dictation of another. It must also be remembered that, even granting that this plan is a remedy, it is by no means the only remedy that is open to us, and that it is quite possible to take perfectly efficient measures for preventing the evils of obstruction without dragging the Speaker from the dignified position which he has filled so long and so admirably and without making new and tyrannical laws, or inflicting on the already sorely weighted House of Commons the vexation of a double set of rules and orders, and the disgrace of being forced to admit that it is no longer able to bear the mantle of its historic predecessors. It is the misfortune of an ancient and venerable office, like the Speakership of the House of Commons, that although it is easy enough to destroy it, it is impossible to recreate it. Let any one who acquiesces in the assumption by the Speaker of the new functions that are thrust upon him, compare for a moment what the Speaker has been with what he is about to become. He has hitherto been the representative of the whole House without distinction of party; ever ready to smooth over as far as lies in his power the little asperities from which parliamentary life is never wholly exempt, raised far above all reality and all suspicion of partiality, the guide, philosopher, and friend of the distinguished body which he gracefully and fairly represents.

Mark the change. Is there a hard or unpopular thing to be done, it is the Speaker who must do it. Is there a harsh but it may be a just and salutary regulation to be passed, the Speaker must enact it, thus relieving the political leaders on either side of the odium, and concentrating it all on himself. If the law turn out a failure, as the best-meant laws sometimes will, how delightful for party leaders to throw the

blame on the Speaker, and bless their stars that they are not as other men are, nor even as he! It is hardly too much to say that instead of being the representative of the whole house, the Speaker has become by the recent changes an official on the side of the party which is in power for the moment; and that upon him henceforth the hardest and most invidious parts of public duty will fall. He may continue to bear the name of Speaker, but the essence of his position will be gone. It is extremely vexatious to reflect how different might have been the state of affairs if the Government had addressed themselves to discovering an efficient remedy for the obstruction which had made itself so manifest during the last session, instead of plunging at once into the irritating question of the Irish Bill. The time that was wasted during the whole month of January would have been sufficient in all probability to have carried a really efficient and useful measure, which would have effectually prevented the scenes which have disgraced Parliament during the present year. I venture to think that the Clotûre pure and simple, as it is applied in other assemblies, would have been a perfectly efficacious and appropriate remedy.

How little the measure of Government was to be relied on may be judged of from the fact that it was only by what I suppose I must call a lucky accident that it ever came into effect at all. The Government were driven to do what can scarcely be called a legal act when they supported the Speaker in refusing to hear any further debate and forcing on a division while the speakers were yet unexhausted. But even this would have availed nothing if it had not been for the singular blunder of the Irish members, who contrived to get themselves turned out of the House, while if they had remained in it they might have made the passing of what is called the Speaker's *coup d'état* impossible. Fortune favoured the Government, but it was a good fortune that they had no right to expect.

Yet even with this unexpected piece of good luck the machinery that the Speaker devised seems unequal to what is required of it. After all the trouble and all the violence which has been necessary to obtain these laws, the result seems to be that they will not work; indeed it was not likely that they should. Favoured as they have been by fortune, the Government seem likely to profit very little by their success. They seem to have founded their hopes on the supposition that the Opposition, whose business it is to differ from them as much and as often as possible, would always be ready to give them help. Strange as it may appear, this sanguine hope has only once been realised and then promptly disappointed. It really was not worth while to commit all this violence to break so many rules and traditions in order to obtain a power which can only be used when the two rival factions in the House are in perfect agreement. It is their business to differ, and the Government assumed that their agreement was certain. It therefore comes to this, that after straining their powers to the

very utmost and doing things which nothing but success could excuse, the Government find themselves accommodated with a machine which, as might have been foreseen, refuses to work for the very purpose for which it was created.

I have hitherto confined myself to recent events, which have naturally attracted, in an especial degree, the attention of the country, but the truth is, that this is only part of a larger subject to which the attention of Parliament must very shortly be directed. It is quite evident that the new machinery, for whatever reason, has broken down, and that, if we are not to be the laughing-stock of nations of whom we have hitherto been the admiration, we must find some expedient for restoring it to its ancient efficiency. As regards the question of which we have just been treating, I respectfully submit that there is but one remedy, and that remedy the one which almost every other nation has adopted. Of course the remedy that I point to is the *Clotûre*, but the *Clotûre* divested of all the embarrassing and unpopular elements with which it is connected in our present dispensation. I have shown, I think, very sufficient reasons why, in the first place, there should be no special rules at all, and, in the next place, why they should not be placed in the hands of the Speaker. There should be no special rules at all, because every well-ordered State ought to be able to select the best laws for its purpose, and should not have recourse to the miserable makeshift of an alternative. There should be no special person delegated to bring these special rules into force, because, if that person is of no dignity or account, he is unfit for so great a trust; and if he be, like the Speaker, a person of the highest dignity and consideration, you lower and ruin his position by entrusting him with such an office.

I can see no reason why laws intended for the promotion of public order and the transaction of public business should not be as other laws, always valid, always known, and always respected; the notion that we are to have laws which are to be brought into effect simply because we are in a hurry to do something, is in the highest degree childish and unscientific. I can see no reason why we should not have laws that work themselves, and require no special person to put them in execution. Such is the case of the *Clotûre* in whatever country it has been applied. If any member is of opinion that some other member is either wilfully or otherwise encroaching upon the indulgence of the House, it is, in almost every other country but our own, in his power to take the opinion of the House on the subject without debate: the House decides, and from that decision there is no appeal. This seems to me perfectly fair and just: the time is not the time of the individual member, but of the House in general, and it is for them to judge whether that time be properly expended or no. Nothing can be more unreasonable than that it should be left to the unrestrained discretion of those who have the

power of spending it, to what extent they will use or abuse that power, No man is a good judge in his own case. The public time is a possession of inestimable value, and it is the highest degree of waste fulness and prodigality to suffer it to be expended at his pleasure by any one who may chance to obtain possession of it. The only real corrective, therefore, of the state of things that has just occasioned so much trouble is to give the House the power, not by noise or by obstruction of any kind, but by a vote which can be taken in the ordinary course of business, of stopping a debate whenever a majority of members think it necessary to put an end to useless discussion. There is also this advantage, that, whereas the person who is admonished by the Speaker necessarily feels a certain degree of anger and ill-will at the treatment he has received, the expression of impatience by the House raises no personal animosity, and passes away with the circumstance that occasioned it. Time is not the possession of the individual, but of the State, and the State that allows it to be filched from it is wanting in the duty which commands it carefully to hoard every precious thing that it possesses.

But it is not merely in questions like these that the opportunity for vast improvement exists. Let us think for a moment over the whole course of business now carried on in the House of Commons. The quantity that has to be got through is something stupendous, and not only is it extremely great but it is multiplied many times more than it need be. The whole machinery of the House of Commons was directed towards a certain object, to resist and prevent the encroachments of the Crown. It is in order to prevent the Crown from refusing the reasonable demand of the subject that grievance always comes before supply. That was no doubt a wise and necessary precaution at the time when the Crown was an object of fear and apprehension to the people; but in the days in which we live it ceases to be justifiable. The right of putting grievance before supply has now no effect whatever on the Crown, but it greatly impedes and retards the transaction of public business. The same thing may be said of the different stages of a bill. These were no doubt required, not because our ancestors wanted to hear the same thing over and over again, but to prevent any chance of a matter being inserted by which the Crown might gain some advantage over the people. It is in the simplification of our procedure that the true method of enabling the House of Commons to overtake the vast amount of duty laid upon it is to be found. I hope therefore that I may be excused if I treat this important subject a little more in detail.

The cause of our troubles is not far to seek: it consists in using an instrument which was devised for one purpose for the prosecution of another. The last thing that ever entered into the minds of those who made these rules was that they should be employed to cramp the rights and liberties of the subject. It is quite easy to see

that the rules and orders of the House of Commons were devised with a single object, to protect the House against the overweening power of the Crown. The object was to prevent surprise, and, if surprise should take place, to give abundant opportunity for reconsideration and redress. The liberties of England were won step by step, granting supplies in return for the abolition of obnoxious claims and laws. We have long arrived at the point where 'rights conceded leave us none to seize.' But with true British tenacity we adhere to the form when the substance has departed, and insist on embarrassing ourselves with rules whose reason is gone and whose utility it requires an antiquary to discover.

Let us trace the passage of an imaginary bill through the House, and mark the redundancies and superfluities as we go along. Why should a bill be read a first time at all? It was quite reasonable in the days before printing, when bills were short and when many members could not read, and those who could had no copies, but it is quite superfluous now. Again, when a bill has been read, why should not the House proceed at once to discuss it in committee? and if the bill pass without serious alteration, why should it not pass at once? The advantage of a second Chamber is that it can correct oversights and mistakes in the first, and it is, I think, far better that a slip should sometimes occur that can thus be mended than that valuable measures about which there is no serious dispute should fail session after session because there is no time to consider them over and over again.

Then again as regards questions. Can anything be more deplorable than to see a full House waiting for two hours, the first and best part of the sitting, while Ministers are employed in answering sixty questions which might just as well be proposed by placing them as now on the printed proceedings of the House and answering them on the paper of the following day. A reservation might be made in favour of persons who have been Cabinet Ministers to meet cases of urgency.

It would seem not to be an unreasonable rule that no one except the person having charge of a bill should speak more than once on the same point in committee. The bill itself is more important than the committee on the bill, and yet on the bill itself only one speech is allowed.

Of course with the prohibition to read a question aloud would fall the power of moving the adjournment of the House even where the right of asking a question verbally was reserved to ex-Cabinet Ministers. The Speaker might also be permitted, where on a division there appears to him to be a large majority, to require what he believes to be the minority to stand up, and if he proves to be right, to record their names only.

These may suffice as instances how much lies in the power of the House of Commons as regards the economy of time, and how far the

House of Commons is from having exhausted improvements of the simplest and most inoffensive nature in its own proceedings; but the question of questions, in comparison with which all others sink into comparative insignificance, is the question of the disposal of the time of the House. It is the most valuable thing the House possesses, but as to any property or control over it the rules of the House are silent. It must be assumed that it is infinite in quantity, since everyone is permitted to take, and I may say to waste, just as much of it as he pleases. This omission to make provision against the waste of time probably arose from the cause already indicated, the fear that advantage might be taken by the Crown of restrictive rules to cramp the freedom of debate. That reason exists no longer. What, then, is the rule as to time in the House of Commons? simply that a member must not speak twice on the same subject with the Speaker in the chair. It is from the strange omission of any rules with regard to time that all these rivers of bitterness flow. I cannot believe that this enormous omission, as mischievous in practice as it is anomalous in theory, will much longer be allowed to exist. Be lavish if you will of your money, for that you may recover, but be thrifty of irretrievable time.

What, then, shall we do with it? To whom shall we give the right to dispose of it? It is really time that the question should be answered. My answer would be—‘The time of the House is the property of no private person, it is the property of the House of Commons, and it is the absolute right of the House of Commons to dispose of as it thinks best for the public service.’ It is little less than a crime to allow the wanton waste of this most valuable of human possessions. It remains, then, to consider what use the House should make of this priceless treasure. Shall the House throw its time open to be seized by the first comer and applied as his dulness, his ignorance, or his vanity may direct? Or shall it not rather keep the key of this treasure in its own hand, and reserve to itself the right of seeing that it is properly expended?

The question then remains, by what machinery shall the House of Commons exercise that power over the time of the House which it undoubtedly possesses. Had it not been for the Speaker’s rule requiring a majority of three to one, I should think the right of the House to decide by a simple majority how long a debate is to last was too clear for argument. The rule that the majority shall decide is adopted not because the majority is necessarily in the right, but because we must decide somehow, and the question is not what is right, but what at a given moment is the will of the assembly. The counting of members is not a sure way of ascertaining truth, but a perfectly sure way of ascertaining what we want to know, the will of a certain body of men at a certain time. It merely says that the strongest party shall prevail, leaving the question open for fresh

discussion. The claim of the majority being thus established on this perfectly fair and reasonable basis, can anything be more absurd than to refuse the House the liberty of closing the debate when such is the will of the majority? I can understand saying, as we do when not under the clutches of urgency, that a debate must go on as long as there is anyone tiresome enough to speak; that is, that the House ought to have no power over its own proceedings. But to say that it ought to have that power, but that it shall not be exercised unless a majority of three to one agree to it, passes my comprehension. How can we, without falling into the grossest contradiction, act on the rule that the majority shall prevail, and then pass a law placing the majority under the minority by saying that 299 members shall be outvoted on a division by 100. The inference which I wish to draw from this argument is of great importance, and it is this—that whenever the Clôture is applied, the question shall be put as on any other question and the majority shall carry it. This, in my opinion, is the key of the whole position. Do this, and the House of Commons is master in its own house. Omit it, and the House will be, as it has been hitherto, at the mercy of every self-complacent bore, or of every professed obstructor, who degrades himself in order to degrade it.

It may be said that if we restore to the majority that natural right of which it ought never to have been deprived, the right of disposing of its own time, we are placing the minority utterly in the power of the majority. I apprehend no illusion can be more groundless against such an abuse. The absolute ubiquity of parliamentary proceedings, as secured by railway and telegraph, is a perfectly adequate remedy. A party in a minority could desire nothing better than that the majority should use their power to prevent their adversaries from using arguments which they were unable to answer. The press would take care that nothing was lost. Besides, it is not the interest of either party to introduce a practice by which, if once introduced, they would be sure to suffer in turn—

Debita jura vicesque superbæ
Te maneant ipsum. Precibus non linquar inultis.

From a somewhat long experience of the House of Commons I should say that it is the last assembly in the world that would give any countenance to an attempt to stifle fair and *bonâ fide* discussion; and that when the time arrives in which the Parliament of England is not willing to hear both sides, it will be, not a question of rules and orders, but of a complete change of the machinery of Government, that will have to occupy the attention of the nation.

THE
NINETEENTH
CENTURY.

No. LI.—MAY 1881.

THE 'SILVER STREAK.'

THE 'silver streak of sea' is a phrase that has grown familiar to us, and often repeated by our statesmen it soothes the public ear.

It appears but a picturesque expression without much political significance, yet taken with all it involves and implies, it is the most momentous expression of a fact unique in the world's history, or of a delusion as dangerous as any which has deceived a nation. Briefly the phrase embodies an Englishman's belief that, thanks to the 'Silver Streak' which surrounds his shores, he alone of the earth's inhabitants need never fear foreign invasion. Strange that the 'great highway of nations' should for his enemies be impassable! Yet if such be the fact and the 'Silver Streak' is the Palladium and the charm which guarantees us from the worst of calamities—if it be the sufficient substitute for colossal armies, conscription, a fortified metropolis, and a war establishment in peace time, it is an unspeakable blessing, and worth the trouble of understanding, were it only to avoid giving foolish reasons for our national belief.

But what if the supposed immunity be a delusion, and the 'Silver Streak' one of those fatal phrases which, like the 'invincible army' of France, lull a nation to such sleep as preluded the catastrophe of 1870 and the infinite humiliation of Sedan? Without prejudging the question whether the 'Silver Streak' be passable or not for a foreign invader, it is at least certain that the reasons usually given for thinking it so are worthless, and will not bear examination.

Let us briefly review the most usual and important of these reasons.

VOL. IX.—No. 51.

3 D

Uttarpara

Chakrishna Public L

The first assigned will probably be the superiority of our Navy—‘superior,’ to use the words of a leading journal, ‘to any other navy or any two other navies combined—practically superior to all other navies united.’ This is a very bold statement, or rather it embodies three statements, but the first is doubtful, the second untrue, and the third an absurd exaggeration. Our navy may or may not be superior to that of France; experts like Sir Spencer Robinson¹ hesitate to decide on that point; but so far from its being superior to any two navies, if we add one navy—say the Italian—to that of France, they would be vastly superior to the British—intrinsically superior in strength, but still more so strategically for two reasons. England cannot concentrate all her forces for defence, having to protect her communications, commerce, and colonies, whereas France could concentrate her whole fleet for attack. It may therefore be fairly assumed that strategically, as the assailant operating against one point, while we must cover many, France by herself would have a great naval superiority for attack. This, as will be shown, is a simple fact, and, considering the official theory, that our navy ought to be equal to any probable combination of navies against us, a very important fact. That so many persons should in the present day, in the teeth of facts and figures, assume such a superiority of our navy above others united, is a singular instance of a belief surviving the facts in which it originated. For it *was once* well founded, that is towards the close of the great

¹ Admiral Sir Spencer Robinson (see *Nineteenth Century* for March 1880) writes with the experience of several years as ‘Comptroller of the Navy,’ the department charged with the construction of our fleet. As such he was necessarily acquainted with the nature and value of every ship in our service, but he acquired from official and other sources full details of the French navy also. He puts the actual *serviceable* line-of-battle force at 24 English to 22 French (in 1880). This proportion varies slightly from time to time, but we may expect henceforward to see the French navy maintained on nearly a level with our own. France has discovered the secret of her own vast and unsuspected resources, and possibly gauged the weakness of our naval system. The following statement gives the efforts making by both countries to increase their fleets:—‘At the present moment England has eight ironclads either on the stocks or launched and being completed for sea—namely, the “Inflexible,” 11,406 tons; the “Ajax” and “Agamemnon,” each of 8,492 tons; the “Colossus” and “Majestic,” each of 9,150 tons; the “Conqueror” and “Collingwood,” each of 6,200 tons; and the “Polyphemus,” an armoured ram of 2,640 tons; while two armoured cruisers, each of over 7,000 tons, are to be shortly begun. France has twelve ironclads either launched and being completed for sea or on the stocks—namely, the “Amiral Duperré,” of 10,486 tons, the “Amiral Baudin” and “Formidable,” each of 11,441 tons; the “Turenne,” “Duguesclin,” “Vauban,” and “Bayard,” ironclads of the second class, each of 5,880 tons; the “Caiman,” “Requin,” “Indomptable,” and “Terrible,” armoured coast-defence vessels of the first class, the first-named of 7,239 tons, the other three of 7,184 tons each; the “Furieux”—also an armoured coast-defence vessel of the first class, but of 5,695 tons only; while four ironclads of the first class—the “Hoche,” “Marceau,” “Magenta,” and “Neptune”—are to be immediately begun. Italy has three ironclads building or completing for sea—namely, the “Dandolo,” of 10,570 tons, and the “Italia” and “Lepanto,” each of 13,700 tons; while another armoured ship of about 12,000 tons is to be taken in hand this year.”—*St. James’s Gazette*, March 2, 1881.

war with France, and the superiority of our fleet over the aggregate fleets of Europe may be said to have lasted up to 1830 or a few years later. At two epochs since then, when France built the first successful screw line-of-battle ship, the 'Napoleon,' and a few years later invented ironclads, she for a time took the lead and actually possessed a temporary superiority at sea, but our faith in the 'Silver Streak' was unaltered.

Not less unfounded is the belief that individually our ships are superior to all others. As a fact about which any man may satisfy himself, Italy possesses two ships, the 'Dandolo' and 'Duilio,' far more powerful for offence or defence than any we possess, and is engaged in building two more, to surpass those above named. Two or three years at least must elapse before we could produce ships of equal force.

Compelled then to admit, as any one who takes the trouble to inquire must be, that our ships are neither collectively nor individually superior to all others, the believer in the 'Silver Streak' theory will perhaps rely upon the supposed superiority of our sailors. Now what is a sailor? Primarily a man employed about sails and sailing, a man pursuing his vocation

Poised in mid air upon the giddy mast.

But sails are abolished in our new navy, and ships no longer sail—they steam, owing nought to the sailor's art, and this involves a vast change in his relative value. He never goes aloft in the new ironclad which has no masts. In the olden time the qualifications of an 'A.B.' (Able Seaman) were briefly summed up in the formula 'Can hand, reef, steer, and heave the lead.' The first two have no place in our modern navy, and ships now are steered even by steam-power, while as to heaving the lead a young landsman learns it in a month. But that is far from being all the change in the value of a sailor. The sailor of the olden time was not only the mover and conductor of his floating citadel, he was in a great degree its constructor; spiderlike he wove his own web. The inert hull alone was the work of the shipwright, but all that wondrous superstructure above the deck was created and maintained by the sailor's skill. Day by day, and in very few days, he raised those towering masts, securing them so skilfully by shrouds and stays, all his own handiwork; then he got up those huge yards, he bent those sails, he gave wings to the ponderous hull, and his skill managed those wings. It used to be said that the French built better and faster ships than we did, yet they rarely escaped us when chased. Why? Because we were better sailors, could *sail* our ships better, get more speed out of them, by that nice adjustment of the sails and trim of the ship which may be compared to jockeyship in racing. But much more was our sailors' skill shown in repairing with surpassing ability the havoc made by an enemy's fire in this ingenious fabric. Upon that

skill, and upon rapidity in its exercise, the fate of a battle often depended, and the superiority in such sailorlike efficiency was on our side. But what part has the sailor either in the construction or repair of the machinery which has superseded masts and yards and rigging and sails? It may almost be said of him 'Othello's occupation's gone,' and that in great part he is now a passenger rather than the operator. At best he is a marine artilleryman in his iron casemate.

Under circumstances so totally altered, then, we cannot say that England, having better sailors than her rivals, must win the day. If seamanship or sailor skill in Nelson's day counted for seventy-five in the hundred, it does not count for ten now.² Our sailors may be victors in the future as in the past; but we must not draw inferences as to the future from the past, for all is changed.

It is not then to a fleet 'superior in all respects to any probable combination against us' that the believer in the 'Silver Streak' can look, but perhaps he may turn to the obvious and natural argument of 'past experience.' Eight hundred years' immunity from invasion (at least on a large scale when opposed) may seem a very long prescriptive title.

Unfortunately we can neither appeal to 800 years', nor one year's, nor even to one day's experience as at all relevant to present circumstances. We have never been at war with a naval Power since the days of steam fleets, of ironclads, of huge steam transports, and colossal armies not only on a war footing but so constituted as to take the field at a week's notice. To draw inferences as to the present, when such things are, from the past, when no such things existed, would be absurd.

No great combinations such as an invasion would require, were possible in the days when the movements of a fleet depended on wind and weather. Could *land* forces even carry out any combined movements if they depended on wind or weather? Would the battle of Waterloo have been ever fought if 'trusty old Blücher,' instead of informing Wellington that he might rely on the support of the Prussian army on the 18th of June, had made that support conditional on there being no change of wind, no storm, no calm?³

But with steam, armies escorted by fleets can be carried far more

² A French naval writer in the *Revue des Deux-Mondes* describes with admiration the brilliant manœuvre of a British frigate, commanded by Sir T. Symonds (now Admiral of the Fleet) during the attack on the forts of Odessa. A strong breeze was blowing, making it necessary to reef topsails. The frigate had carried sail to baffle the enemy's artillerymen by the rapidity of her movements. When it became necessary to shorten sail, she delivered one broadside, hove in stays, reefed her topsails while tacking, and then delivered the other broadside. No such brilliant *tour de force* can be ever performed now.

³ One might push the argument from this instance even further. The weather on that June morning did actually, and perhaps fatally for the French, delay their attack for several hours (until 11 A.M.). That rain could have had no effect on an army embarked.

certainly, more rapidly, more conveniently, by sea than by land. In the late highly creditable march of Sir F. Roberts, his army covered seventeen miles per day, and has been very deservedly lauded for that performance. Had they been embarked, twelve times that distance would have been below an average rate, and fifteen times would have been possible. The voyage too, unlike the march, implies neither fatigue to the men or horses, nor any wear and tear of material. Our regiments sent to the Cape of Good Hope this spring traversed the Equator and penetrated far into the Southern Hemisphere, say a voyage of 6,000 miles, in less time and with infinitely less strain in every way than would have attended a march from end to end of this little island. The march to the Cape by land would not have been effected (on friendly territory) in a twelvemonth! But the strangest idea connected with the 'Silver Streak' is that the transport of material by sea is an insurmountable difficulty! The refutation of this fallacy is the *argumentum ad absurdum*. If transport by sea be difficult, transport by land is impossible; therefore there can be no future war! Any one seeing for the first time a ship discharge a cargo, say of 2,000 tons, must have been astonished at the multitude of carts and baggage animals required, and the miles of road covered by that single cargo.⁴

But no one acquainted with military affairs or the ordinary operations of commerce will doubt that in these days all the *impedimenta* of an army can be carried by sea with far greater facility than by land. Another common misconception is that an opposing land force can resist a disembarkation with advantage, but this is an utter delusion. That a force covered by a fleet will make good its landing is a foregone conclusion, as experience no less than reason must show. No army could expose itself to the unsubdued fire of a fortress, and a fleet is a fortress with far heavier artillery. Of course it is assumed that the invading force chose a suitable landing-place (say Pevensey Bay), and I do not remember a single case in naval history of a landing being prevented or even opposed upon an open beach of the kind. The first four popular reasons for assuming the invulnerability of our island have therefore no force whatever, but a fifth has somewhat more weight. Though a landing covered by a fleet cannot be opposed by a land force, it may be said, 'What if the enemy be attacked by sea at the moment of disembarkation?' Unquestionably the danger to the invaders would be great, but is war by land or sea ever free from danger and difficulty? Would not an army attacked when debouching from a defile or forest without time

⁴ The calculation is easy. Suppose English farm-carts to carry one ton each, a liberal allowance for a march. Each horse and cart occupies about 18 feet, or 6 yards; therefore a string of 2,000 carts carrying 2,000 tons will (in single file) occupy 12,000 yards, or 6 miles and 1,440 yards, nearly seven miles. Of course on roads broad enough to admit of a double line the length would be but halved. If we substitute beasts of burden for carts, the ground occupied would not be less.

to deploy be in equal danger, or, for that matter, when on the line of march in a long column that would require some days for concentration? Any one reading the history of the war of 1870-1 will see that the van of the German armies was often a hundred miles in advance of the rear. Of course, if a French army suddenly concentrated could have attacked those long straggling columns in flank, they might have been destroyed, but it was the business of the German commanders to prevent any such thing, and they understood their business.

So also in the supposed case of an invading force it would be the business of the commander-in-chief not to attempt a disembarkation at all likely to be interrupted. Now in these days of electric telegraphs a fleet could hardly escape the notice of ships in communication with a coast telegraph, but beyond this an invader would rely first on his look-out ships, and secondly upon his covering fleet, which must be assumed as superior to the British. Twenty look-out ships (small craft) at distances of fifteen miles apart would cover a line of 300 miles' length, and thus give, say, thirty hours' notice of an enemy's approach, and much could be done in that time. But the issue of the enterprise would depend upon the conflict between the covering fleet and our own. Upon that conflict the future history of England and the world might depend, and therefore, after all, the fate of England would depend upon our having a *superior force in the right place at the right moment*. Where then is the peculiar value of the 'Silver Streak'? Would not any country be equally safe from attack by land under the same conditions? The superiority of force (as will be proved further on) would in all probability be on the side of an invader *choosing his own time and point of attack*; and as to our fleet being on the right spot at the right time, that would depend upon the Admiral Commanding-in-Chief not being drawn off by a feint, as Nelson was by Villeneuve in 1805. Yet Nelson has been justly called 'the greatest seaman of all time.'

There are no doubt less obvious difficulties unsuspected by all but professional minds, matters of detail in fact which have more value than those generally relied on; but of these hereafter. Thus it appears that the weightiest of the popular reasons for relying on the 'Silver Streak' is very far from conclusive, while the others are either misconceptions of the facts or arguments of no value. Still it may be contended that popular errors do not alter the question, and that at all events the responsible British statesman with full knowledge of all the facts must see reason to think England is safe in presence of an armed Europe. Unfortunately it is only too certain that British statesmen (of both parties alike) are far less conversant with military affairs than continental statesmen. Foreign cabinets, taking the French for example, always contain more or less of the military element, and all classes have some idea of the first principles

at least of the science of war. But it is no exaggeration to say that the ignorance of those principles among our own statesmen even of the first rank is stupendous and alarming. There are probably few statesmen having devoted their lives to the public service who have yet found time to acquire so much general information as Mr. Gladstone. In fact, his great powers of accumulating knowledge are equalled by his avidity in doing so, and if we find him controverting the elementary principles of the military art, what can we expect from minor stars? It has been held by all military authorities that the possession of Belgium by France would in case of war be a great danger to England. Napoleon held this opinion very strongly, and expressed it in his usual vigorous language, but Mr. Gladstone differs with him and accuses him of talking nonsense.

In the *Nineteenth Century* for September 1878 (p. 74) Mr. Gladstone, after detailing the means taken by his Government in 1870 to defend the neutrality of Belgium, says: 'But it was not (in my view) properly a danger to any immediate British interest. The Napoleonic saying about Antwerp is exaggeration carried to the confines of nonsense.' But Napoleon's opinion was that of Marlborough in the eighteenth century, of Wellington in the present, and of every soldier or sailor from the days of Louis the Fourteenth to our own; for the same primary rules apply to the defence of a country by sea and by land, and in this case the principle involved is very plain. France and England (and from France alone could successful invasion ever come) face each other from the two sides of the Channel as two armies drawn up face to face. All the vigilance of England would be sufficiently occupied in watching the enemy in front. Now it was the opinion of Napoleon that if France could place a fleet on the left flank of England at Antwerp, it would in the first place double the area needing such vigilance and offer double the assailable area; secondly, assuming that all our land forces were needed to defend our south coast (as they would be), a landing on the east coast would take those forces in flank and rear—that is, at the greatest possible disadvantage. This is surely obvious; but Mr. Gladstone probably relied entirely on the 'Silver Streak.' Still, if he sees no more disadvantage in having an enemy threatening two coasts than one, it would follow that there would be no more danger in having an enemy threatening three coasts and being in possession, suppose, of Ireland as well as Belgium. Surely no one conversant with the first principles of war would admit this.

A colleague of Mr. Gladstone's, a man of ability in civil affairs, showed an equal disbelief in the received maxims of military science in a lecture delivered at the United Service Institution.⁵ We do not

⁵ On the 15th of May, 1872, Sir W. Harcourt (now Home Secretary) undertook to demonstrate the impossibility of invasion in a lecture of great ability, but his reasoning, though supported by statistics ingeniously arrayed, did not convince the pro-

of course expect our statesmen to equal our admirals or generals in professional knowledge, but it is alarming to find members of a Cabinet totally unacquainted with the conditions on which the national defence depends.

For it is our statesmen, not, as some people think, the professional members of the Admiralty, that really decide upon the force and form of our navy, and this accounts for its manifest insufficiency to meet emergencies. We heard much lately about 'scientific frontiers,' *i.e.* frontiers devised by experts to meet the requirements of science, but we certainly have not at present a 'scientific navy' to answer such a definition, nor have we had one for many long years. The truth is, our navy is a 'House of Commons navy,' devised to suit financial, or, as the French would say, 'Budgetary' considerations, and to meet the criticisms of a body profoundly ignorant of all military and technical principles. No naval officer would contend that in a war with France alone, our present ironclad navy could protect our colonies, our commerce, and our communications with India, and likewise provide a superior force to defend our shores. By concentrating every ship we possess, in the Channel, we might possibly do the latter, but that would be to abandon India and all our colonial possessions, and to deliver our commerce (including our food supplies) a prey to the enemy. To prove how completely inadequate our navy is as a 'war navy,' let us even suppose some mystic virtue in the 'Silver Streak,' making it impassable, and merely consider our commerce involving our food supplies and our means of defending it.

Of the whole world's commercial shipping, England owns 58 per cent. or more than one half, and Mr. Giffen considers 'the tendency to be towards a change still more rapidly in our favour.' France, on the other hand, owns but 11 per cent. of the world's commercial shipping and only one-sixth of England's. One would imagine that

professional audience he addressed. Sir William was compelled by the circumstances of the moment to take Germany, not France, as the assumed invader, because, French territory being then occupied by German armies, the other supposition would have been too obviously improbable. But this, of course, substituted the German Ocean for the 'Silver Streak,' and changed the whole basis of the argument. Yet further, Sir William went back to the Crimean War, with its sailing ships occupying eight days to traverse 300 miles, and carrying a mere fraction of the numbers now carried by steam transports. Again, he imagined a difficulty in finding, under the supposed invader's flag, sufficient shipping to transport an army, and assumed that 'international law' would restrain neutrals from selling or hiring ships to a belligerent. Recent history shows us that Russia would have found no such restraints had hostilities broken out with England, and to a nation with the wealth and credit of France the whole world's markets would be open for the purchase or chartering of as many ships as she wanted. Sir William lastly assumed that we should closely blockade every French port, because the United States, having a fleet, blockaded the Confederates, who had none. To blockade an enemy you must have a superior force, but even with one the days of blockades are past. A blockading fleet would be a perpetual target for torpedoes and submarine mines, and how could the supply of coal be kept up in the open sea?

our fast cruisers for the protection of our own commerce or the capture of an enemy's would be in the same proportion, but so far from this, in the special forces needed for the purpose, France has an actual superiority. How can this be explained unless by supposing that the French naval force is constituted to meet the exigencies of war, and our own to meet the exigencies of home policy? Our means of protecting our shores, which we consider unassailable, are naturally less adequate even than our means of protecting the commerce which we admit enjoys no such immunity. Nor is it easy to see how any ministry awaking to the danger could apply the only remedy by a large expenditure. We have got into a groove out of which there seems no escape, by practically losing that superiority which we still dream that we possess and declare to be a vital necessity. A minister who realised this fact and determined practically to recover our supremacy by building a score of ironclads would not only incur the censures of opposition, but would violate the tradition of his own party. Both parties in the State have for years acquiesced in the fiction of our having a navy superior to any two others and the reality of our having nothing of the kind. Some twenty years ago the Prince Consort, a man of clear judgment, and under no delusion about 'Silver Streaks,' wrote to the Duke of Somerset, First Lord of the Admiralty: 'The French have unfortunately got a year's start of us, which I am afraid they will keep unless we make *very* great exertions and are more successful than we have been at present. It must be borne in mind, however, that numerical equality with France means real inferiority.'⁶ At this period, when, as usual, the faith of Englishmen in the 'Silver Streak' was unaltered by the facts, the patriotic vigilance of the excellent Prince may have saved us from unknown disaster. He at least was not asleep, nor did he allow the ministers responsible for the country's safety to live in a 'Fool's Paradise' of security, for to Lord John Russell we find him writing: 'It is a perfect disgrace to this country, and particularly to the Admiralty, that we can do nothing more than hobble after the French, turning up our noses at their experiments, and, when they are established as sound, getting horribly frightened.'⁷ That this was no hasty expression of alarm may be judged from the fact recorded by his biographer, who states: 'A copy of a report (December 1, 1860) by Lord Clarence Paget, sent to the Queen, revealed the fact that just as, in 1858, we found to our dismay that the French equalled if not surpassed us in the number and strength of line-of-battle ships, so now they possessed, in iron-plated vessels built and building, a force considerably more than double our own.'

Yet twenty years after the good and wise Prince had so written, we find a flag officer of great ability and exceptional opportunities of

⁶ *Life of the Prince Consort*, by Theodore Martin, vol. v. p. 257.

⁷ *Ibid.* vol. v. p. 256.

judging between the French navy and our own hesitating to decide which is really the strongest—the strongest absolutely, not relatively to the commercial and colonial needs of the two Powers. To add to this great fact it must be remembered that a first-class ironclad cannot be run up in a few months like our old wooden ships, but requires from two to four years for its construction. Thus the popular and very natural assumption that the government of the day, with its special knowledge of the facts, must have provided against the possibility of invasion, melts away before examination like all the other grounds of the blind belief in the ‘Silver Streak.’ That there are great obstacles and serious difficulties in the way of invasion no one ever doubts, but the term ‘difficulty’ has in all cases some relation to the object to be achieved. We find this in private as well as public life. The deterrents which are effectual when the end in view is of little value, disappear or are forgotten when a great object is to be attained. A man proposes a foreign tour with his family, but is deterred by some small inconveniences or difficulties. He then learns that the life of a wife or child requires such a change of air, and the difficulties vanish.

Napoleon’s invasion of Egypt was a case in point. The difficulties, a hundredfold greater in those days than now, were immense; but so were the supposed advantages of success, and three generations of Frenchmen have applauded the enterprise, doomed as it was to utter failure. A still more remarkable and apposite case was his projected invasion of England in 1805. Napoleon admitted that Nelson’s appearance on the scene during the disembarkation would be fatal to him and his army. But he considered the occupation of London was an object justifying the risk. For a successful invasion of England implies advantage to the victor simply incalculable, reducing the dangers and difficulties of the attempt to insignificance. We know the utmost penalty of failure, the total loss of the fleet and army, but who can estimate the advantages of success, military, political, commercial, financial, moral or sentimental? Are the French smarting under the memory of recent humiliations? These would be more than effaced. They love ‘glory.’ It would be theirs beyond precedent or imagination—empire surpassing the dreams of Napoleon because extending far beyond Europe. Commercial grandeur in proportion, a ransom, but in short more than can be conceived or expressed!

Having, as it is believed, justly stated and controverted the popular reasons for believing in our insular invulnerability, let us see what reasons can be alleged for the contrary opinions here maintained.

The general conclusion arrived at by the writer after many years’ study of the question is that, balancing the obstacles on each side, invasion by sea in *these days* is less difficult than invasion by land; or, to state the conclusion with particular reference to England, that

on the whole the existence of the 'Silver Streak' would in some degree facilitate successful invasion from France. But is the writer alone in this distrust of the 'Silver Streak,' or is it shared by the 'intelligent foreigner' to whose judgment we often appeal in argument? Let the reader turn to the last number of the *Nineteenth Century* on 'The Military Impotence of Great Britain' from a foreign point of view, and let him bear in mind that foreigners like Captain Kirchhammer, the able writer of that article, use the term 'military' as including 'naval.' It is in fact to our naval as much as our military position that he addresses himself, and with what result? He looks at our widely extended, far-distant, and scattered possessions in the four quarters of the globe; he sees our rich commerce distributed over every ocean, and, looking at our shrunken navy, asks: Is there any proportion between the tempting prize and the scanty forces that guard it? But Captain Kirchhammer goes further. He is no believer in our national superstition about the 'Silver Streak' as a guarantee against invasion, and he thinks that a hostile force once landed would meet with but feeble resistance. As an officer of the General Staff of Austria it is his business to study the resources offensive and defensive of other Powers; he has done so with respect to England, neither overlooking her immense absolute strength nor her relative weakness, and he comes to the conclusion that weighed in the balance of nations we are found wanting. Nor let our complacent optimists say, 'That may be the opinion of a foreigner, an Austrian little acquainted with naval affairs.'

Unfortunately his details as to our naval resources rest chiefly on the authority of distinguished British officers of the sister services. Indeed the blind believers in our island security would find grounds for changing their opinion in the pages of the *Journal of the Royal United Service Institution*, which may be called the organ of professional science for the two branches of the service.

In discussing this question it must be understood that the assailant is assumed to be France, that country alone having the requisite geographical conditions of proximity and other advantages indispensable to success. As happily at this moment nothing is more improbable than war with France, the matter can be discussed entirely from a theoretical and professional point of view, and under no feeling of suspicion or hostility, still less of panic.

Looking then at the advantages which would be on the side of France, the first, and a very important one, would be the general belief in England that invasion is rendered impossible by the 'Silver Streak.' Nations do not provide against the impossible, and hence a hundred necessary precautions would have been omitted, and a first success against our shores would create confusion and panic unspeakable.

Secondly, it was a maxim of Napoleon that rivers form bad

military frontiers because they prevent acquiring intelligence of an enemy's movements (by spies, scouting, and otherwise), and conceal an enemy's movements, while they can always be passed under sufficiently heavy fire of artillery. The first reason applies equally to the 'Silver Streak.' We should know nothing of the movements of the enemy's armies. It may be objected that we should see 'the concentration of transports in the enemy's harbours,' but no such concentration would take place in these days of steam until the last moment. Of this hereafter.

Thirdly, an invader by land, having decided the point at which the enemy's frontier is to be crossed, must fix a corresponding basis of operations whence to draw his supplies, thus revealing his line of attack; but where a fleet is the basis of operations no such indication is given.

Fourthly, an army invading by land must move so as to secure its communications, and, having chosen its objective point, cannot change its line of advance. A naval armament carrying its own supplies may change its direction as often as may be desired without the least inconvenience.

Fifthly, a large army invading by land advances from ten to fifteen miles a day. The same army embarked advances 240 miles a day or upwards. The army invading by land incurs fatigue to men and horses and considerable wear and tear of boots, clothes, wagons, draught cattle, and material of all kinds. By sea the same army avoids all such wear and tear and waste of material.

Lastly, a large army when marching, being confined to roads, can only move in columns of length proportioned to its numbers. Thus, as in the Franco-German War, the head of the column may be a hundred miles or more from the rear, and several days may be required before such column can be concentrated for battle. The army embarked can move in close order, the whole within sight and capable of landing so as to form at once for attack or defence.

In this comparison the action of an enemy has been purposely excluded from both sides. No one denies that a superior British fleet attacking the armament in its transit or while landing would be a great, perhaps fatal, peril to it, but no greater than that to an army attacked on the line of march, or indeed an army badly defeated and forced to retreat in an enemy's country.

It seems hard then to escape the conclusion that in these days when (for short distances) ships can carry from 1,000 to 3,000 soldiers with their arms and ammunition, conveying them at the rate of, say, twelve statute miles an hour, without halt, fatigue, or wear and tear, a sea frontier presents peculiar facilities of invasion.

It is impossible to conceive a more formidable armament than an army so supplied with wings and threatening not one only but every point of an island.

How can an army marching two or three miles an hour, and that only along roads, cope with an army moving twelve miles an hour in any direction it pleases? Is such an armament steering for Cork? Its destination is probably Pevensey Bay. Is it making for that point preparing to land? Its designs are on the north shore of the Thames. It can change its course this hour, and resume it the next. It can separate, reunite, disperse, only to meet again at a given rendezvous. No sagacity can foresee its movements, no cavalry even keep pace with them. Briefly, such an armament alone can invade by surprise, since the slow approach of an army by land can be known for days, while the naval armament in the enemy's ports at this moment may be on our shores in a few hours' time. With these advantages, then, in favour of invasion by sea, with the advantages always belonging to the assailant, and with the strategical advantage belonging to France, implying correspondent disadvantages to England, let us glance at the general conditions of a successful attack.

The first condition would obviously be suddenness and secrecy in embarkation; the second, avoidance of a superior British fleet during the transit; the third, the choice of the best point or points of invasion; the fourth, rapid and orderly disembarkation.

These points involve the highest professional skill and ability, and still more such a deep study and mastery of the whole problem as we may safely attribute to our gallant neighbours. It is morally certain, though not capable of proof, that at different times, under Louis-Philippe and Napoleon the Third, the problem of invading England must have been fully worked out and elaborated. When some future historian has access to the secret papers, now pigeon-holed in the French Admiralty and War-office (and no more interesting secret literature can be imagined), such historian will no doubt show a profound difference between the French system and our own. Englishmen know little of the French navy, which, not being a House of Commons navy like our own, is constructed and governed upon professional principles as a 'war navy' with a definite purpose. Although there is much reticence in France about that purpose, we can clearly see that it has reference to our navy. While we talk about 'the paramount necessity for our fleet being superior not only to any other but to any probable combination of other fleets,' the French, content with maintaining a real equality, leave us to dream of possessing such superiority. Twice, as already said, in the present generation, France by her inventive genius obtained for a time an actual superiority when she invented screw line-of-battle ships in 1851, and ironclads a few years later.

After the disaster of 1870-1 the urgent necessity for strengthening their army led to the French navy falling below its normal strength, but at the beginning of last year (*teste* Sir S. Robinson), silently, quietly, and by good management, it was raised to a numerical equality with our own, implying an absolute superiority on any given

point. And when we consider that France obtained this relative position at far less cost than we pay for our own navy, is there not reason to believe that the genius which created the French navy could employ it with terrible efficacy in active warfare?

Let us then assume with the best authorities that in number and force of ships the two navies are about on a par at the breaking out of hostilities. Would any British naval officer deny that *cæteris paribus* the power of striking the heaviest blow must, in the nature of things, be on the side of France? We do not want her few colonies; her merchant ships are but a sixth of our own; we can only act on the defensive. But France becoming the assailant has the choice of two objects, on either of which she may concentrate her whole force. She may attack us either at home or abroad, with the immense strategical advantage her geographical position between the Channel and the Mediterranean, with impregnable harbours in each sea, gives her. She can in fact force us to divide our fleet while she can suddenly concentrate her own; for the Minister who kept our whole fleet at home, the only means of securing equality of force there, would be driven from power in a week, and his successor (too late) would send half our fleet to the Mediterranean to secure our communications with India. But though our existing navy is manifestly unequal to it, we may assume as a normal disposition that one half will always be in the Mediterranean or in more distant seas,⁸ the other half left for the defence of Great Britain and—a vulnerable point at present—Ireland. The whole of our ‘effective fleet ships intended for a general and combined action,’ after deducting ships of obsolete proportions or otherwise unserviceable, amounted last year to twenty-four. The French ships similarly defined amounted to twenty-two. Out of these England has eleven first class and thirteen second class, France having ten first class and twelve second class. The special ships—that is, those that are adapted to co-operation with fleets in a general action and for defensive purposes—are about equal in number and value on both sides.⁹ This estimate, which may be thoroughly relied on, will appear very startling, and not to correspond with official statements. But the difference arises from the exclusion of all but really efficient ships—a sifting which only men acquainted, like Sir Spencer, with the secrets of office would be equal

⁸ British statesmen on both sides have often declared the absolute necessity of maintaining our military communications with India by way of Egypt. To do so, then, with France for an adversary, we should require the whole of our present scanty force in the Mediterranean. Where, then, is our Channel fleet to be found, or squadrons to protect our trade and colonies?

⁹ See article in *Nineteenth Century* for March 1880 by Admiral Sir Spencer Robinson, K.C.B., formerly Comptroller of the Navy. Captain Kirohhammer allows the English navy a superiority of one third over the French navy, which he still considers insufficient for our needs; but, for the reasons already given, Sir S. Robinson’s calculation is more to be relied on. Captain Kirohhammer considers that the total of the world’s navies is to the English as 244 to 64, or say 4 to 1—i.e. in ironclads.

to. Though this proportion between the two fleets may vary slightly in future, it may be taken as the normal relation to which British ministries of both parties have now reconciled themselves.

Thus, as the trifling difference here shown is sometimes on one side and sometimes on the other, we may consider the two navies numerically equal, which, as already said, means a practical inferiority for England. But this does not only arise from the multifarious duties calling off our fleets to numerous weak points. There is a strategical superiority on the side of France from the fact that she is geographically between us and our Indian Empire. Further, for our present purpose—invasion—she would possess a still greater superiority as the assailant, choosing the point and time of attack. The problem then for a French commander charged to throw a force of, say, 100,000 men on an enemy's coast guarded by an inferior naval force, does not seem so impossible as we carelessly assume it to be. But possible or not, there are two more popular delusions on the subject which Englishmen would do well to dismiss from their minds.

Firstly, arguing from irrelevant past experience, it is imagined that French admirals, though brave, are incompetent. A second delusion is that invasion would be planned on the one side and resisted on the other as in the olden time, although all the conditions are changed. Now, regarding the first delusion, if there is a body of highly educated scientific and in every way competent men in the whole world, so far as *la grande guerre* is concerned, it is to be found in the upper ranks of the French navy. In pure 'sailorship,' to coin a word of more restricted sense than seamanship, they may not equal their English brethren, but the French admirals have a far larger sphere of action. They are often Cabinet Ministers, and no one wonders to see them so. They are sometimes ambassadors, very usually governors of colonies. In the supreme hour of French danger, the defence of the Parisian forts was entrusted to them, and well did they discharge that trust.¹⁰ French admirals commanded divisions of the army, and always with credit if not with success. But, what is equally to the purpose, the constitution of the French navy and the share allotted to the naval officers in its maintenance and government give them an insight into what may be called great questions of policy studiously denied to our own. What would be said to a Naval Lord of the Admiralty who presumed to tell a First Lord that the country was not safe with a navy barely equal to the

¹⁰ Most readers of professional works will have read Admiral de la Roncière-le-Noury's elaborate and scientific work on the defence of the Parisian forts, which will ever be associated with his name, although he was assisted by several other admirals. One might name among French Cabinet Ministers in recent days who were admirals the gallant Jauriguiberry, Pothuan, De Saissset, all Ministers of Marine; Admiral Fourichon, War Minister; Admiral Jaurès, recently appointed Ambassador to Spain. Generals Chanzy and Faidherbe, the most distinguished in the Franco-German War, had both served in the French navy.

French? He certainly would not have a second opportunity of giving a professional opinion on a 'House of Commons navy.' In France, where the head of the navy is often an admiral, it is very different, and in a navy equal to our own we see the results.

But of this we may be sure: the French Admiralty, a professional body, has often discussed and thoroughly threshed out all the contingencies of a naval war, invasion included. As to the second of the two delusions just referred to, we may rest assured that when all the conditions of naval warfare are changed, the methods of attack and defence will be equally so unless the boundless facilities for great military combinations on the attacking side are to be thrown away. When armies in peace are not only increased tenfold, but are organised above all things for sudden operations—when ships can be timed to reach a given spot at any given moment—an expedition will not be concentrated at one point for weeks and months beforehand. Nor will our fleets, as has been fondly supposed, hermetically seal the ports of France by blockades, which are things of the past. The French at least will never allow their fleets to be blocked up again as in the days of sailing ships. Getting rid then of mere delusions and misconceptions, we come to the actual means of transporting an army across a very narrow sea, France being assumed as the assailant. To point out the precise mode of effecting a great combined operation of the kind would be presumption in the writer, but the *élite* of the French navy have doubtless thought it out, as they cannot be assumed to believe in any mystic virtues of the 'Silver Streak.'

Without then pretending to go into details, any one who has studied the subject can describe in rough outline the necessary conditions of success. We may be sure that, so far from concentrating the whole expedition in the port nearest the object of attack, the opposite plan would be pursued. If Pevensey Bay (fatal spot where the two Conquerors of England landed¹¹) were aimed at, the main body of troops suddenly moved down might embark at the more distant ports, affording no indications of the true design. Again, still assuming the same objective point, one or more small expeditions would probably be directed against other points, even sacrificing them entirely to promote the main object. What consequence would 10,000 or 20,000 or 40,000 men be to a country counting its soldiers by millions?

But of course the first object of the invader would be (as Napoleon planned) to draw off our fleet or the greater part of it to a distant quarter; and this, under actual circumstances, would be easy. An attack or a mere feint on Egypt would infallibly take half or more of our force a fortnight's sail from our shores, and as that attack could be made without the aid of the ironclad fleet the whole of the latter might assemble in the Channel to cover the main attack.

¹¹ Sir G. Airy, the astronomer, a learned antiquary, considered Pevensey the spot where Julius Cæsar landed.

Napoleon said, 'Give me command of the Channel for twenty-four hours, and England will have lived;' but in the case here supposed the French might have that command for several days. The main difficulty then overcome, the next point is the embarkation of the army, which would need all that accurate and intelligent organisation for which the French are famous. People have doubted whether any country but England can produce the required shipping for the embarkation of a large army. But this is an error,¹² and involves the further error of supposing that a belligerent can only employ its own ships. War knows no *meum* or *tuum*. Every English ship that could be laid hold of, every neutral ship that could be hired or collusively seized—in other words, any amount of transport—could be secured in a few days. Each ship with a French officer on board would be consigned to a given port, and there appropriated to its special duty. Some ships of course would be seized by our cruisers, but more would escape, and for predatory warfare the French have faster cruisers than we possess. Thus in a few days harbours previously empty would fill with transports, and the different *corps d'armée* (each complete in itself under the present system) would be simultaneously marching to their point of embarkation. The exact time required in each instance for getting the corps on board would depend upon the amount of convenient wharfage and the skill of the officers employed; but such cases as the embarkation of our army at Varna afford no sort of guidance. Whatever despatch intelligence and experience can insure we might expect from the French; and in their own harbours there is no reason to doubt that working day and night an army corps with all its material could embark in forty-eight hours.¹³ Other corps of course would do the same, and four or five army corps might very conceivably be embarked in the ports of Toulon, Marseilles, Rochefort, L'Orient, Brest, and Cherbourg (a few years hence we are promised a capacious harbour two hours' sail from Dover, but that is in the unknown future). So far, then, even the believers in the efficacy of the 'Silver Streak' will, if ever so slightly acquainted with warlike operations, see no difficulty, and we have at the various French ports an armament of from 80,000 to 100,000 soldiers afloat in harbours inaccessible to us. Can they cross the 'Silver Streak' and land on our inviolate shore?

In their favour the assailants have first the incalculable advantage that Englishmen believe invasion to be impossible, and secondly

¹² No one doubts that a French agent sent to a foreign port, such as New York, could succeed in buying or chartering ten or twelve first-class steamers, and what one agent was doing in that port other agents could do simultaneously in other ports. Nor must it be forgotten that on the first rumour of war British shipowners would hasten to transfer their ships to foreigners. What should prevent French agents securing as many as they needed?

¹³ Thiers tells us that the different army corps intended for the invasion of England had learned to embark infantry, cavalry, and artillery in six hours!

that while the invader knows his own plans and chooses his own time, his opponents can know neither. A third immense advantage would be found in the different system under which the two navies are constituted—the French a professional, our own a House of Commons navy. With all these advantages does any one doubt that the First Napoleon would have managed to embark his 160,000 men of ‘the army of England,’ and throw them on our shores? It would be child’s play compared with the task he actually proposed to himself in 1805. True, Nature is sparing of such abnormal genius as his, and no ordinary commander would inspire the same confidence. Still, so far as the mere transit is concerned, the chances seem greatly in its favour. If we suppose the passage, say to Pevensey Bay, safely accomplished, we may assume the disembarkation of the troops effected also, as of course that most important and vulnerable point is practically defenceless, and resistance to a landing there would be impossible.¹⁴

Here, however, the real difficulty, or rather inevitable delay, would occur, and that in no imaginary obstacle. Though the immense and concentrated wealth of England in supplies and provisions of all kinds would enable an invading army to reduce its *impedimentu* to a minimum, still the indispensable amount could hardly be landed in forty-eight hours, or only by the greatest exertions. A feeble commander might find it impossible, but it would be one of those ‘impossibilities,’ which genius turns to opportunities. However that may be, the soldiers at least, with sufficient ammunition and provisions for two or three days, would be landed very rapidly, detachments occupying Hastings on one flank, and Eastbourne on the other. The village of Pevensey with its old ruined castle rising above the marshes would afford a strong position for its centre and cover the landing of the military stores. The rich towns already mentioned, with the adjacent villages, would supply the army with draught horses, carts, and rations, and a considerable district might be securely held before any British force could muster. The disembarkation effected, the invaders’ policy would be to ‘burn the bridge behind them,’ certain that if London were ever reached it would be unnecessary. So far then as the ‘Silver Streak’ was concerned, the problem would have been solved, and it is beyond the purpose of this paper to prosecute the subject further. Whether the invaders would reach London, striking a mortal blow at the heart of the Empire, who shall say? This indeed we may assume. The news that our inviolate shores had been reached and occupied—that our navy, asserted by authority to be equal to all emergencies, had proved the contrary—would kindle such blind rage among

¹⁴ The little obsolete ‘martello towers,’ mounting a very small and unserviceable gun each, could not be used at all in modern warfare. The shingle with which they are surrounded would, when struck by an enemy’s shot, cover the towers with such showers of stones as would overwhelm the defenders.

the masses, and lead to such riots and insubordination, as would greatly assist the enemy. The Admiralty would naturally be the first object of popular vengeance, and the First Lord of the day, possibly an exceptionally good one, would probably be the first victim. Of all the positions in which a statesman could find himself, his would be the most pitiable if he escaped with his life, for on his head would fall the very natural maledictions of the people. But the mob would most likely hang the First Lord and burn the Admiralty, following up that outrage, after the manner of excited mobs, by attacking the Horse Guards. If the then Commander-in-Chief and War Minister did not anticipate the action of the mob, they would probably be its next victims. But all this would not improve matters or contribute to the national defence. A new First Lord, a landsman of course, and a new War Minister, perhaps a lawyer, would have to be found, and meanwhile the enemy is advancing. The march from Pevensey to London, sixty-five miles, traverses no defiles like the Kyber or Bolan passes, no mountain ranges, gloomy forests, broad rivers, or sandy plains. London once sighted by an enemy is taken, or would be after one shell had hurtled through the air, or one rocket had roared through its murky canopy. Unconditional capitulation would be a necessity, and the idle fancy that 'the retreat of the occupying army might be cut off' is sufficiently answered by 'J'y suis, j'y reste.' To buy out the enemy, to furnish him with any number of golden bridges, would be our task, but he could neither be fought out nor starved out of the world's wealthiest market. The enemy might perhaps be bribed by the cession of our navy, our Indian and our colonial Empire, and a war indemnity of some 500,000,000*l.*, with free transport for the army, to relinquish our shores; but what would he leave behind? The democracy, justly incensed by the proved incapacity of the governing classes to discharge the first duty of a government, would depose them from power. The complex framework of English society would fall to pieces. Industry would be paralysed and public credit destroyed. 'L'Angleterre aura vécu:' the one country in Europe that had for eight centuries been free from invasion would have felt the conqueror's heel. A land whose monarchy had been the expression, whose sovereigns the loved guardians, of the popular liberty, would have owned a foreign master, and the fiction of the 'Silver Streak' have been dispelled by the realities of an iron age.

DUNSANY.

PEACE IN THE CHURCH.

I.

THE PUBLIC WORSHIP REGULATION ACT.

WHEN I had first agreed to consider the policy of the Public Worship Regulation Act, I felt some misgivings at my temerity. But in the interval all apprehensions have quite disappeared, and I can now buckle to, not, I hope, with a light heart, but in a trustful spirit. The truth is, that meanwhile the question has been raised, and virtually settled, in a sense corresponding with my own conclusions, not by any casual layman, but by the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury and his com-
Provincials in sacred Synod assembled, as well as by the House of Lords.

When a householder sends for the slater, or the plumber, or the carpenter in a hurry, the reasonable inference is that he suspects something amiss about his dwelling. But when carpenter, plumber, and slater are all commanded to meet over the condition, not of that one mansion only, but of the whole row in which it stands, then, indeed, it may be concluded that extensive repairs are called for to restore the buildings to tenantable condition. The Archbishop of Canterbury's proposal, accepted by the Ministry and House of Lords, for a Royal Commission upon Ecclesiastical Judicature, is more than an excuse for a plain-spoken retrospect of the origin and policy of the Public Worship Regulation Act.

This concession has made the doings of seven years ago ancient history, and justifies me for treating it in the free method appropriate to a retrospective inquiry.

I am apt to become suspicious if I find any writer who embarks upon an historical research too loudly boastful of his impartiality. Industry and accuracy are among the chiefest requisites for a trustworthy historian. But of these good qualities, assuming the honesty of the writer, there can be no more sure guarantee than the consciousness of some message to deliver, some mission to fulfil, some opinion to establish. The student who is indifferent as to the goal to which his researches may lead him lives under a perpetual temptation of preferring the easy, the picturesque, or the popular. Intending then to be scrupulously accurate in my statements, I do not claim the

cold and negative merit of viewing the Public Worship Regulation Act from the neutral position of a disengaged bystander. My place is among the members of that old High Church party, the 'historical High Church party,' which has, for some years past, had abundant cause for astonishment at finding that in proportion as Ritualists and Ritualism are denounced for the capital offence of unpopularity, it is itself being constantly hurried to the edge of that dangerous abyss which, as we know, yawns for those of whom all men speak well.

Accepting for the moment the startling statement of the late Prime Minister, that the Public Worship Bill was brought in to put down Ritualism, I shall attempt to recall the light in which the measure, so explained, presented itself to the members of that historical High Church party of whom, in his subsequent sentence, Mr. Disraeli had nothing but good to say. To speak very plainly, I consider it to be one of the gravest misfortunes of that Public Worship legislation, that it has created a wholly fictitious *eidolon* of 'Ritualism, irrespective of the rites which may make it up;' and in providing special machinery of the 'urgency' class to suppress its own figment, it has cast a slur upon, and done an injury to principles, the disallowance of which would be the dissolution of the actual Church of England. It has embarked Puritanism in a sacred war against ceremonial *en bloc*, and it has often made it a point of honour with Ritualists to defend *en bloc*, as if they were inseparable, a variety of usages which might otherwise have been separately considered on their respective merits.

I am not a Ritualist. Long before Ritualism *eo nomine* was heard of, I had matured my ceremonial convictions, and taken my stand as an ecclesiologist upon certain principles of English Church worship, which I find in the Prayer Book of 1549, and also in that of 1552, and for ourselves most authoritatively in the actual statutable book of 1661, and which I recognise expounded, exemplified, and illustrated in the writings and in the doings of Andrewes, Wren, and Cosin, of Sparrow and Sancroft, and of Wilson and William Palmer. Secure in this position, I can look with equanimity upon that miscellaneous muster of phenomena which are ignorantly classed together as Ritualism.

While I find in that fluctuating array of actions and theories things which make me grave and sorry, I add with gratitude that I recognise much which lifts up my heart in thankfulness at toil, discomfort, and privation, faced and borne for the glory of God and the salvation of mankind.

To pass from Church to Forum, I am driven to conclude that any general definition of Ritualism, so framed as to be cognisable as an offence by Act of Parliament, is an absurdity, so long as the Prayer Book exists as a schedule to a statute. To create an indiscriminate

moral offence of Ritualism is equally absurd, when so many incidents which pass under that name are the inevitable and meritorious results of that great revival during the last half-century of holiness and zeal in the Church of England, in which—outside of the regulated oppositions of parties—every writer has found something to praise, with the eccentric exception of an historian who finds his way to the ear of cultured Englishmen by his exquisite style. ‘Owing, as we do, to this revival,’ in the words of the Archbishop of Canterbury’s recent Charge, ‘a more reverent appreciation of the value of the outward forms of religion,’ we find, as must always be the case in payments in full of debts long contracted, that all the coin will not pass current at the bank. To say that a movement is rapid, popular, and unexpected, is to say that such must be the result, and the enemies of High Church ceremonial have no more right to be jubilant on the fact than its supporters have need to be downcast.

‘Movement’ is a noun of multitude, and when you have a number of men in movement, some of them must, from physical causes, always occupy an extreme position.

Such, as I venture to lay down with much fear of contradiction, but with no fear of refutation, is the truth about ‘Ritualism.’ But what was the theory about it which lay under, and invited that attempt to put it down with which we are concerned? I shall best make my explanation clear by borrowing an illustration from modern medical science. All who are familiar with contemporary therapeutics must be familiar with the great and increasing attention which is being paid to the phenomenon of blood-poisoning as the key to many maladies, the results of which had hitherto been so deadly because their origin was not appreciated.

Many a blood-poisoned patient has been cured by being treated for blood poisoning. But obstinately to assume that the man who has dislocated his shoulder is victim to the vicious condition of his circulation, and to substitute alkaloids for splints, may sometimes kill the patient. I should be sorry to think that there had ever been any risk of this calamity having been reached from riding hard the theory which appears to me to underlie the policy of the Public Worship Act, that Ritualism was the poison which had infected the life-blood of the English Church. Still, no other supposition can account for the peculiarities of the measure. Of course, if such was the case, the results which followed were the mishaps inevitably incident to all mistreatment, even by the ablest practitioners.

I may note in passing, that I have seen a statement by an authority which we are bound to respect, that the Public Worship Act was the natural growth of the recommendations of that Ritual Commission which sat from 1868 to 1872, and in particular of the recommendations of its first report, which called to life the ‘aggrieved parishioners.’ As a member of that Commission, and one who, in

signing that report, had to add an explanation in the sense of my present remarks, I must very distinctly contend that the recollections of my respected friend are not quite clear. The report dealt specifically with vestments as markedly distinct from the general body of rubrical observances, and pronounced that these dresses ought to be 'restrained.' This word was intentionally suggested by the High Church members of the Commission in preference to any other, as not involving definite abolition, but some elastic machinery of regulation. The same High Church members wisely or unwisely suggested restraining, through the machinery of a plurality of 'aggrieved parishioners,' as an improvement on the single delator provided by the Church Discipline Act.

This recommendation of the Commission, I repeat, was one having reference to some process of 'restraining' in contrast to 'forbidding,' and that in regard to one particular ceremonial usage which was far more strange in 1868 than it is in 1881.

Every argument of policy which might have recommended it within this limited range was its condemnation, if applied to the unlimited uses of the Public Worship Regulation Act. The true fulfilment of the spirit of the recommendation would not have been the introduction of that measure, but a concordat on the Eucharistic dress. If the concordat had failed, still the Public Worship Bill would stand in no logical relation to the attempt to make it.

The lay memorial against ceremonial, presented during the summer of 1873 to the Archbishops assembled at Lambeth, was, no doubt, the public incentive to legislation, and unhappily that emanated neither from the Right nor the Left Centre, but from the pure Left. A better form of pastoral—something more grave and ecclesiastical—might, I venture to think, have been devised for revealing the coming event than the leading article which appeared in the *Times* on the 10th of March, 1874, with the effect of diverting some portion of that public attention which was at the moment concentrated on the just past general election and the incoming administration.

In due time the Archbishop of Canterbury brought into the House of Lords the Public Worship Regulation Bill, in a speech evidently intended to be moderate, but which was dashed by an unhappy oversight. The Archbishop was led in his exposure of motives to refer, in illustration of the necessity of such legislation, to some proceedings which had recently occurred in the diocese of Durham, then presided over by Bishop Baring. But when persons asked what were the Ritualistic enormities which had produced that stir, the discovery was made that his Grace had placed in his hands the case against a clergyman as moderate as he was eminent, the late Dr. Dykes, for doing no more than taking the Eastward position. This incident seemed to imply that the menaced men were not the Ritualists so called, but the whole High Church party—the great phalanx of the

Purchas remonstrants. I have no doubt that his Grace was speaking from superficial information, and I greatly, therefore, regret having to refer to the mistake of one whom we all so deeply respect. But historical truth compels me to refer to an incident which had so unfortunate an influence in attuning the feelings, not of Ritualists, but of the old Church party, who felt that they were being swept into the net. This was not the only unfortunate appearance which the Eastward position made in the House of Lords, for later on in the debates, the Bishop of Peterborough, with peace-making intentions, proposed a schedule of neutral things which virtually meant that rite, and the Lord Chancellor with impetuous zeal suggested ballasting it with the Athanasian Creed. Nothing more was heard of any neutral schedule.

But I am outstepping the march of events in the House of Lords. The mischief of the Bill as it was brought in was, that it set up a meddlesome system of Church discipline, based upon minute interference, and incongruously mated with existing organisations. The sting of the measure as it left the House of Lords, and after it had been manipulated by Lord Shaftesbury, who had met it with scorn in its first form, was that it had become as despotic in its provisions as it was innovating in its changes. The principles of the two forms of the measure were not simply divergent, but contradictory. But yet the same prelates who were eager to push it in its first form continued to be equally eager to push it in its second. This fatal bond of continuity linked in one not only the formal stages of the Bill, but the persons and the desires of its active promoters. Churchmen were bewildered at the spectacle of changed measures and unchanged men, and had nothing to answer to the cynical inquiry of irreligious bystanders, whether the whole affair did not sum up in the old proverb that any stick was good enough to beat a dog with.

The first draft of the measure was that of the creation of a series of anomalous tribunals in every diocese, to be presided over by an anomalous bevy of epicene authorities, not quite lawyers, nor yet quite judges; not quite magistrates, nor yet quite umpires; too coercive to be paternal, and too paternal to be authoritative—a jurisdiction novel, motherly, and bewildering. This curious conception was flashed on the public without any previous consultation with Convocation, and when Convocation—justly susceptible at so strange a slight—was consulted, the time conceded to it was so scanty, and the conditions of debate so contracted, that the result was practically to substitute one form of dissatisfaction for another.

In the meanwhile a real demagogic power was at work. The Prelacy had brought their project into their own House of Parliament only to find a great lay will taking advantage of the opportunity which they had so recklessly conferred upon him, and utilising the second reading of a Bill against which he fulminated by blotting out, in the guise of Committee amendments, their work; and instead

writing in, strong and large, his own Cæsarean edicts, destructive as they were of old principles of diocesan organisation and ecclesiastical order, as in other respects, so in the substituting for the two official Provincials, of Canterbury and York, deriving their mission from their respective metropolitans, one judge for all England. The Episcopate had to bow the head and accept this new-coined doomster, and him a judge forbidden to exist without the co-operation of the civil power—subject, that is, to the Prime Minister—such as no spiritual judge ever was from the days of Augustine, of Anselm, of Cranmer, of Parker, or of Tillotson, till, for reasons which I cannot pretend to fathom, our metropolitans made sacrifice of their prerogatives at the bidding of Lord Shaftesbury. Ay, and because he derived spiritual authority from the elect of the ballot-boxes, he was to be relieved, as the Queen's Bench has lately taught us, from all the old solemn ceremonies of ecclesiastical appointment. This freshly devised autocrat, too, was not only to occupy the chief seat in either province, but was, in despite of ancient jurisdictions, and whatsoever may be the inherent prerogative of the Catholic Episcopate, to wander as universal inquisitor into every diocese of the land. Such was the Bill as it left the House of Lords.

The Bill did not reach the House of Commons till very late in the Session, and it was for some time doubtful whether it would live. There were difficulties in finding a sponsor, and the choice which was ultimately made, although probably well suited for a crisis of general effervescence, was far from being a stroke of far-seeing strategy. The lot fell upon Mr. Russell Gurney, Recorder of London. But universally respected and beloved as was that eminent judge, his sympathies, always manfully confessed, for that section of the Church which stands nearest to Dissent, unavoidably provoked criticism upon his being named leader in a movement against the advanced phases of High Churchmanship. The assertions that the Bill meant nothing but fair play to the School of Andrewes, Wilson, and Hook were received with the respect due to grave utterances from high-placed authorities, but the thought could not be repressed—why, then, pick out the Recorder?

It is incumbent on me to add that Mr. Gurney discharged his difficult task with eminent courtesy and moderation. Upon the incidents of that distempered night, when the debate on the second reading commenced, and upon those of that still more unhappy Wednesday, when a new House of Commons in a spasm of turbulent, unreason read the Bill a second time, I decline to dilate, for the recollections of these days would hardly make for peace. The tide of popular impulse was on that second day at its very highest. I had been long enough actively mixed up in Church controversy to recollect the excitement, culminating in sacrilegious riots, fomented by Lord John Russell's Durham letter, and so *pejora passus* I was not so much terrified as some of my friends of a later generation. A few

days showed that the tide was turning in the adoption by the Committee of the House of Commons of Mr. Hubbard's equitable amendment, which put defect on the same footing as excess. Happily the moderation of High Churchmen has left this provision a dead letter, but it was none the less needful to place it on the statute book. Another action of the Committee was not so equitable, which refused to make bishops amenable to that same discipline which they were so prone to forge against priests. The division list showed conspicuous Liberals side by side with Sir Stafford Northcote, Mr. Hardy, and Lord John Manners in supporting the amendment of which, as I shall ever remember with satisfaction, I was the mover.

So the Bill went back to the House of Lords, and while there the regrettable spectacle was afforded of a divided episcopate. The question was whether the bishop's discretion to refuse his permission for a frivolous or vexatious suit should be hampered by an appeal to the metropolitan. Happily the majority of lords spiritual was in harmony with the majority of the House in refusing to admit the limitation. After what has passed within the last month in Convocation we may inoffensively conjecture that no regret any longer exists at the decision.

I hurry over much which has passed since the Bill became law. A choice of judge, not among jurisdictions where some knowledge of ecclesiastical law still lingered, but in tribunals more conversant with putting asunder what God had joined together, than with bringing together and binding up; disputes about salary where salary seemed already to exist; perplexity as to where to sit and what to rule when a sitting place had been borrowed; scandals about customary confirmation and canonical declaration are not incidents which have tended to create among Churchmen that confidence in, and respect for, the Public Worship Regulation Act which had yet to be built up, in spite of the loud shouting of its promoters. One incident may be noted, as especially to be regretted, manifesting as it did the underlying, though doubtless unconscious, influence of that blood-poisoning prejudice which I have already noted. I refer to a collective pastoral of nearly the entire Episcopate, of which, out of respect for those whose names are affixed, I will say no more. The Pastoral of 1851, child of the Wiseman-Russell panic, is forgotten, signed though it had been by Blomfield and Wilberforce, but denounced by Phillpotts, except so far as it survives in the incisive words addressed to his clergy by the Bishop of Exeter. I am glad to believe that no more enduring vitality can be predicted for the Pastoral of 1875.

The apologists for the Public Worship Act are fond of urging that some of the prosecutions which have hampered the Church within these recent years have taken place, not under that statute, but under the Church Discipline Act. The argument is legitimate in their mouths, but it is based upon a misconception of the grievance of those

who regret the legislation of 1874. Their complaint is that the intolerance which that measure encouraged, and the litigious persecuting spirit which it evoked, were so abundant and virulent as to overflow the margin of the Act itself, and spread abroad their pernicious influence. All the ceremonial prosecutions since 1874 may not have been prosecutions under the clauses of the Public Worship Regulation Act, but they were all prosecutions under the policy of the Public Worship Regulation Act.

The conclusion which I should desire to submit to those who have thus far followed me is, in the hopes of some no very distant remedy, not too nicely to dogmatise upon the status, in the eyes of canonists, of the Public Worship Act jurisdiction. The complications which have, since the Reformation, marked the relations of the English Church and State, would make the investigation of their legitimacy in the eyes of the Church law a very entangled inquiry. But I do claim to have established that there are grave causes to justify the wide dissatisfaction which that statute has created, and to call in the ripeness of time for a liberal reform, reviving the diocesan courts, and restoring to the Metropolitan sees their unadulterated appellate jurisdiction as the consideration for a generous amnesty. I feel most deeply the risk of any present appeal to Parliament, and so I abstain from the responsibility of dictating times and seasons, and, indeed, the question has passed into the hands of the Royal Commission.

II.

LIBERTY NOT LICENCE.

I have no pretension to be a leader of thought; my place is that of an industrious and, I hope, a trustworthy labourer, whose ambition is to gather up, and present the thoughts of those who have gone before, and who claims a hearing for conclusions of other men which he essays to reproduce, not only because he respects the minds from which they proceed, but because he believes that, in owing to this respect, he is the mouthpiece of a large number themselves worthy of consideration. I have nothing to pull down, and if I propose to build up anything, it will be with seasoned materials prepared and laid down ready for the artisan. My theme is 'liberty not licence,' in reference to existing difficulties in the Church of England; and I believe that as much liberty, not only as can be good for any Christian community, but as much as any Christian community can stand and withal cohere, is found within the authentic historical documents of the Church of England, comprehending not only the Articles, which all parties claim for their views, but also its series of successive Prayer Books, which are so often appealed to in proof of divergent doctrine, but which I prefer to look on as one majestic symphony. It is to these Prayer Books taken as a

whole, and reciprocally explaining each other, that I appeal as giving us a common historical ground upon which, in this national Church, under the actual conditions of clerical subscription, all recognised parties, High, Low, and Broad, within the Church of England can live together, study together, and labour together, with advantage alike to the body politic and to their own distinct schools of thought and work. The advantages from this comprehensive treatment of documents which I claim for myself as a High Churchman I equally claim for the other parties, for I am thoroughly convinced that it would be an evil day alike for the Church of England and for religion in general if any one of these three parties were to be cast out of, to be estranged from, or to retire from, the one mother Church of the country. The High Churchman may have his preference for the Book of 1549, and the Low Churchman for that of 1552, while the Broad Churchman, if he is sensible, will probably come to the conclusion in which High and Low will also practically agree, that, all in all, it is safer to adhere to the forms of the Prayer Book in the shape in which it has come to us with a more than two hundred years' presumption and the testimony of the eighteenth no less than of the seventeenth and of the nineteenth centuries, than to risk the disturbance inevitable to legislative change. Thus each section may formulate its conditions of contented acquiescence; each will have its particular reason, but the result will be identical and common. Let our present task be to develop this somewhat neutral attitude of reciprocal toleration into the more active one of real liberty, by showing how it conduces to insuring common respect for the differing convictions of every section. If the three Prayer Books represented hostile or antagonistic systems, there might be acquiescence, but there could not be harmony; there might be a forced truce, but there could not be peace, and therefore, things being in a state of siege, there could not be liberty.

My appeal is to the documents themselves, and the question to which I demand an answer from them is this: 'Is it peace or war between yourselves?'

This appeal is the loyal one of a devoted member of the Reformed Church of England, accepting fully its reformation in spirit no less than in form. Whatever controversy may exist about the commencement or the close of the Reformation period, it must be acknowledged that with the promulgation of the English Prayer Book the English Church had entered upon its reformed phase of existence.

I repudiate as strongly as any one who has signed Bishop Perry's counter memorial, 'the reintroduction of long discarded ceremonial which symbolises doctrines repudiated by our Church at the time of the Reformation, and which is therefore identified with the superstitious doctrines and practices of the Church of Rome.' Such reintroduction would be licence, not liberty. But I equally repudiate as

the abridgment of liberty imputing to ceremonial because it may be unfamiliar, or to doctrine because it may be liable to be misunderstood by the ignorant or the prejudiced classes, the blame of symbolising Roman superstition, when, in fact, such ceremonial and doctrine only represent one phase of Anglican verity.

But where, I shall be asked, shall I find my touchstone which is to discriminate between what I praise as verity and what I ban as superstition? I seek it very near at hand, in documents which exist, thank Heaven, for the guidance of every one. I mean our three Prayer Books of 1549, 1552, and 1661—documents which I refuse to consider apart from each other. This test of ecclesiastical liberty is, as every man must own, a practical one.

The liberty, then, which I claim for the three parties in the Church of England as sufficient for the present condition of society, and resting on an historical and documentary basis, is that of the conclusions which may be deduced from the fair and grammatical, but not narrow or technical, comparison of the three Prayer Books, respectively illustrating and qualifying each other, and all of them read in the light of the actual form of subscription. I know that this form of subscription was not long since made light of because it was so moderate and elastic. I leave such eccentric arguments to the enjoyment of their authors.

I am bound in commencing to vindicate my comparative way of treating the successive editions of the Prayer Book, and show cause why each of them should not be regarded as having superseded, and in superseding, passed something like a censure upon the one which it was replacing. Had each revision been launched upon the world without any explanation proffered by an authority equal to and, so to speak, incorporated with its own, or rather being the very source of that authority, there might have been some plausibility in such an objection. But it is notorious that the facts of the case are in direct contradiction to this convenient supposition, seeing that each Prayer Book became law in virtue of an introductory Act of Uniformity which gave the reason for the modifications.

If any later Act of Uniformity had condemned the preceding Prayer Book, that book would have become useless as an element of a cumulative series of documents reciprocally explanatory. But if, on the contrary, the language of the statute is that of commendation, then, of course, the supersession can be only operative for practical purposes, while leaving the documentary value of the composition as a record of opinions untouched. So I betake myself to Edward the Sixth's second Act of Uniformity, that of 1552 (5th and 6th Edward VI., chapter i.), which was passed to supersede the first Prayer Book and to establish the second one, and in it I find that very Book of 1549 described in these words:

‘Where there has been a very godly order set forth by the authority

of Parliament for common prayer and administration of the Sacraments to be used in the mother tongue within the Church of England, agreeable to the word of God and the primitive Church, very comfortable to all good people desiring to live in Christian conversation, and most profitable to the estate of this realm.'

Was ever eulogy more complete or more enthusiastic? The reason given in the Act for the change of Book is not a little curious, being in effect a confession that the prior form was too good for the people for whose behalf it was intended, and for the age on which it had fallen.

The writers and speakers who have from time to time commented upon the first Book as a halting and imperfect attempt at Reformation, a half-hearted desertion of Romanism which had been deservedly supplanted by the complete work of 1552, can never have read, or must have entirely forgotten, the Act of Uniformity which gave its legality to the Book of 1552. I cannot think so poorly of the controversial honesty of any man as to suppose that with that Act stamped on his recollection he could have indulged in such accusations.

I desire to press the importance of the declaration of the Act of 1552, as fixing the permanent value of the formularies of 1549, with all the urgency which I can command, for I believe that its absolute statutable value as an authentic declaration of the principles which govern the legal condition of the Church of England has never been sufficiently brought out. The words are not found in a statute setting up the Book of 1549 with all its details, for any such declaration would necessarily lie under some suspicion of partiality, and it would have been incumbent on me to show that its force had not ceased with the use of the Book itself. There are expressions in Edward the Sixth's first Act of Uniformity commending the book which it legalises; but these I pass over, for the evidence may be objected to as interested. But when that very statute which was passed for the purpose of varying an existing document is absolute and effusive in an unlimited encomium on that document in its original unvaried form, the proof is perfect that the variation is due neither to difference of opinion nor intended depreciation, but to the conclusion that under the circumstances of the times it had become expedient to say the same thing in other words, while—because with other words it remained the same in substance—it was felt due to offer the explanation put forth with all the authority of an Act of Parliament—that the new words and the old words still meant, and were intended to mean, the same thing. We must accept this statement of facts as historical truth, and then unquestionably the testimony of the Act of 1552 is established as being of the highest legal and moral value in regulating the opinions of the whole Church of England, and in contributing to fix the formal interpretation of its various documents as a consistent progressive whole. The Churchmen and statesmen who superseded in various particulars the Book of 1549, declared in their own statute of supersession that it

was a godly order, agreeable to the word of God and the primitive Church, very comfortable for all good people desiring to live in Christian conversation, and most profitable to the estate of this realm.

I can ask no more, nor can any one else who looks with respect upon the specialties of the Book of 1549, to prove that that respect has by the mouth of the authorities of 1552 been solemnly declared consistent with the most absolute loyalty to the Church of England, as affected by the proceedings of 1552 itself. In return, those who cling to the specialties of 1552 have the right to claim the same reciprocal acknowledgments from the other school, while both ought to, and can, unite upon the Book of 1661. For recalling to the reason and conscience of living Churchmen the fact which has fallen into much oblivion, that the Prayer Book of 1549 still lives in the enjoyment of the highest testimonials of its Anglican orthodoxy by the mouth of that unrepealed statute which the unlearned have schooled themselves to believe was its condemnation, I may have opened myself to the imputation of having a bias in favour of that formula. Accordingly, I desire at the earliest moment to explain that there are points on which I believe that the Book of 1552 is an improvement upon the preceding one, and that it possesses special features of worship which I should be very sorry to see the Church of England abandon.

I shall marshal the direct contributions which the Prayer Books of 1552 and 1661 respectively yield to the liturgical treasure-house of the Reformed Church of England, by naming the features in which each of them respectively differs from the one which came next before it. Behind this catalogue of difference stands the great phalanx of agreements which unites the three main editions of the Reformed English Prayer Book into a true triangle of forces.

The modifications which I deem to be the distinctive gains of the Book of 1552 upon that of 1549 are found in its order of morning and evening prayer, and are compendiously the enrichment of the Church by the daily confession and absolution, the use of the Creed at both services, and the enlarged list of days on which the *Quicunque Vult* is said. In 1661, in contrast with 1552, we must look for gains in the Communion Office, and in the occasional offices which I now pass over, as they are not required for my main argument. Earliest comes the first order for kneeling among the initiatory rubrics. ‘*Oblations*’ are introduced into the Prayer for the Church Militant, and its final petition appears blessing God’s holy name for His servants departed this life in His faith and fear, and beseeching Him to give us grace so to follow their good examples, that with them we may be partakers of His heavenly kingdom, returning, as this does, in a modified form from 1549. The rubric prescribing ‘the communicants being conveniently placed for the receiving of the Holy Sacrament’ contributes to ‘good order; the term ‘*Offertory*’ is introduced in reference to the alms of the congregation, which are only treated in the Book of

1552 as a remembrance of the poor without any definite God-ward reference.

The absolution is called the Absolution, and is allotted to the bishop, when present. The rubric is introduced before the prayer of consecration beginning, 'When the priest, standing before the table, hath so ordered the Bread and Wine, that he may with the more readiness and decency break the bread before the people, and take the cup into his hands.' Whatever may be the particular meaning of the rubric, it undoubtedly makes for reverence. The manual directions also—inclusive of that of the fraction of the bread—are embodied in rubrics to the Consecration Prayer instead of being left to the celebrant's common sense. The directions for further consecration appear for the first time. In the final declaration of kneeling, the protest against adoration of any 'real or essential presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood' is changed into 'spiritual presence.' I have left to the last two differences between the Books of 1661 and 1552, because they are variations upon the Book of 1552, made in Queen Elizabeth's republication of 1559, and retained from that edition—the first is, the restoration in the form of administration of the declaratory words of the Book of 1549: 'The body of Our Lord Jesus Christ which was given for thee' (and 'the blood of Our Lord Jesus Christ which was shed for thee'), 'preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life.' The other one is, with a grammatical modification, that ornaments rubric of which all that I dare to say after the Purchas and Ridsdale judgments is, that while those documents, taken in combination with the Advertisements and Canons, order a distinctive Eucharistic dress in cathedral and collegiate churches, respectable authorities, such as Bishop Cosin, Sir William Palmer, Bishop Phillpotts, the judges in *Liddell v. Westerton*, the late Sir John Coleridge—and (previously to these judgments) Lord Coleridge, Chief Justice Bovill, Chief Baron Kelly, Lord Justice James—took it as allowing that dress in all churches.

I do not cavil with those who may think that the Prayer Book of 1552, with all the burden on its back of its recognition of 1549, had better not have been touched in 1661. The liberty of such an opinion in 1881 is incontestable. But I claim as the liberty of other Churchmen, whom I know to be a very large party, to appreciate the modifications of 1661 as clearly embodying a more distinct expression of the idea of offering in the Eucharist and of a presence of Our Lord in the Sacrament, which is not the 'corporal' presence that Rome vainly pretends, but which at the same time, because it is 'spiritual,' does not forfeit the designations of 'real and essential.' Nowhere, however, does the Book of 1661 pass any stricture upon that of 1552, and the proof is accordingly quite wanting which could establish any breach of continuity between 1549 and 1661, bridged over as the gap is by 1552 and 1559. There was one salient ceremonial distinction

between 1549 and 1552 which we are forbidden by the statute of the latter year to assume as having a doctrinal signification—namely, the reduction of the schedule of ministerial dresses given in the Rubrics of 1549 to a single one of its items, namely, the surplice. But this reduction only lingered as a note of our Reformed Church for less than two years, that is, till Edward the Sixth's death, when, in 1553, Mary's reaction became responsible for five more years, and in 1559 began our present era, in which certainly the recognition of the Eucharistic dress finds a place, were it only under the limitations of the Ridsdale judgment.

The specialty of the Book of 1549 resides in its Communion service, and upon this I need not dwell with the minuteness which the established status of the Book of 1661 demanded. The cardinal features of this office, in contrast with the others, are its recapitulation of the Eucharistic dress, and the combination with its prayer of consecration of what are now the separate prayer for the Church Militant and the first thanksgiving after Communion, these being emphatic declarations of that same phase of doctrine which the changes of 1661 intentionally brought into renewed prominence.

A form of consecration prayer closely approximating to that of 1549 has been preserved not only in the special Communion office of the Scottish Episcopal Church, but in the only form recognised and in force throughout all the extent of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, and cordially accepted alike by the lowest and the highest Churchmen of that community.

One word must be dropped in passing in further reference to the incontestable disuse of any distinction of dress between the morning and evening, and the Communion service, even in cathedrals, by the prescriptions of the second Book. I am not the panegyrist of this retrenchment, but I am willing to recognise that it was a genuine recoil from that which was at the time certainly a grievance—the burdensomeness and fulsomeness of pre-Reformational ceremonial. National recoils are seldom guarded by excessive moderation.

It is quite possible very logically to acquiesce in this theory of the Book of 1552, and yet to believe that it has become antiquated by the changed circumstances, when the world in so many directions is spending its energies in levelling all forms and traditional usages. At the same time I think it is only respectful to the Churchmen to whom this train of thought may be unfamiliar to address a few words to the argument, that it may be very well to appeal to the Act of 1552 in behalf of the body of the Services of the Book of 1549, but that no defence of its vestimentary rules of 1549 can be drawn from the commendations of 1552.

I accept the challenge, and I put the question in this form: We
VOL. IX.—No. 51. 3 F

have on one side the Book of 1549, which orders certain dresses, and that of 1552, which only orders a single one. But, at the same time, these vestiary orders stand so apart from the body of the Eucharistic office in either case that the office of 1549 could be as perfectly celebrated in a surplice as that of 1552 in a cope, as actually in its form of 1559 it was celebrated in cathedrals, such as Canterbury under Archbishop Parker, and Durham down to the middle of the eighteenth century, and in college chapels, such as that of Lincoln College, under Archbishop Williams's visitorship. Let us, then, test the grounds on which Archbishop Parker could have justified the venture at Canterbury, or Archbishop Williams in his Oxford chapel, namely, from the language of the office of 1552, emphatically, that is, on Anglican grounds, and not upon that imitation of Rome which Bishop Perry's paper assumes, and still less upon the exaggerated and perverted views of Eucharistic doctrine taught in the Roman Church—in a word, upon the view of the Holy Communion, to which the Reformed English Church clings as a sacrament instituted by Christ Himself, and generally necessary to salvation. Can we or can we not find in the Communion office of 1552 expressions such as would justify some such increment of beauty and solemnity in its celebration as would be naturally symbolised by the specific dress which history tells us was used in cathedrals, and in royal and collegiate chapels, during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries? If we succeed in the search, then the claim for some present recognition of such dress may be wise, or may be the contrary, but it cannot be disloyal to the Church of England, a straining of its doctrines, or a contradiction of its history.

The first exhortation tells us of 'this holy communion.' It is also a 'holy sacrament,' here and elsewhere in the service. To the faithful communicants it is said, 'When we spiritually eat the flesh of Christ and drink His blood, then we dwell in Christ and Christ in us, we be one with Christ and Christ with us.' Again, in the same exhortation, we come across 'holy mysteries,' that phrase also recurring in a later part of the office. In the prayer of consecration again, the reception of 'these Thy creatures of bread and wine' is declared to be 'according to Thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution.' I could multiply quotations, but these phrases are enough for me to assert that at all events the claim for the vesture cannot be put out of court by the phraseology which marks the Communion service of 1552. In face of the evidence of its use in churches, such as Canterbury and Durham after 1559, I may be met with the question: If, then, as you show, you possess the reality of which the dress is only a symbol, why care for the symbol? This is cruelly abstract logic, but it would sweep away the Queen's crown, and the maces of the Speaker, of the Lord Mayor, and of the Vice-Chancellors at the universities. Let the claim stand upon

the same footing as the reasons which exist for maintaining those secular symbols. It can be further justified by the laudable feeling which refuses to repudiate pious similarities with other churches, and older days, in things innocent and laudable, and which cannot find Popery in a usage which is authoritative in the national worship of all the three Scandinavian kingdoms. Finally, it must be owned, for it cannot be denied, that all who, in compliance with the Purchas and Ridsdale judgments, admit the distinctive dress in cathedral and collegiate churches, the mother and model churches of the whole Church, let in the whole principle in its most salient form. As to the attempt to make out that chasuble indicates one thing and cope another, in a church which *at a critical date of its existence ordered either to be used indiscriminately as the English Eucharistic dress*, I can only characterise the pretension as puerile, whether urged by ultra-Ritualist or ultra-Puritan. In a church which has ruled one series of conditions for the chasuble and another for the cope, neither of them depending on natural, but both on positive, law, the question of course is wholly different. But the Church of England took particular pains in 1549 to break down the distinction between the two patterns of richer dress, and for my own part, as an English Churchman of the Reformation, I do not see the quarter from which I can claim or take the vesture except under the arrangements of 1549, which are 'the second year of the reign of King Edward the Sixth,' the year, that is, which gives its name to the Parliament which enacted the first Prayer Book.

I shall probably be asked after what practical end I am driving ; am I working for a conditional restoration of the Use of 1549 as well as for an unconditional recognition of the unquestionable truth, loyalty, and edification of its contents ? I desire to answer with a frankness equal to that with which I presume the question to have been put. I should be glad if means could be found for that conditional use of the Book of 1549 which would give to the faithful Christian of the English Communion that type of consecration prayer which he has now to seek in the Scottish Episcopal Church or in the United States, and that Eucharistic dress which recent judgments tell him he must only look for in cathedral and collegiate churches. But any regulation dealing with the words of the Prayer Book demands the intervention of Parliament, and to the provocation of Parliament, as Parliament is now constituted, to deal with the Prayer Book I have an insuperable objection. So my practical conclusion is to invite High Churchmen, Low Churchmen, and Broad Churchmen to unite in a recognition of the three Prayer Books as reciprocally illustrating each other as the Church of England's charter of Liberty not Licence.

III.

RITUAL RECONCILIATION.

Having probed with, I hope, a gentle hand, the sore of the Public Worship Regulation Act, and having endeavoured to set forth that liberty not licence which is the rightful claim of the High Church party, I have something still to say upon a matter which, although in itself a detail, has by the drift of events been forced into a prominence which imperatively claims for it the commensurate attention of those who have the power and the will to insure peace in the Church. I mean the permission to use a distinctive Eucharistic dress in parish churches corresponding to the obligation to use such dress in cathedral and collegiate churches which has been declared to rest upon their clergy, irrespective of rubrical prescriptions, in virtue of the Advertisements of 1566 and of the Canons of 1604, by the Purchas and Ridsdale judgments.

The conclusions which I shall present are not trumped up for the occasion, but have long been formed in my own mind, for I have already published them so far back as 1874 in my 'Worship in the Church of England,' when the materials for the discussion were not so full as they now are, and I have more than once recalled attention to them. The grievance is of a moral even more than a ceremonial nature, for it presses on so many law-loving clergy and laity, who are unable to reconcile the prohibitions of recent decisions with what they conscientiously believe to be the facts of history and the words of the rubric.

I venture to think that there is a way out of this dilemma which would leave it unnecessary to investigate the legal value of the Advertisements and Canons or the soundness of the conclusions reached by the Judicial Committee in the two suits, for it is one which may be equally accepted by those who take the most and the least favourable view of those decisions.

The legality or the reverse in *parish churches* (in contrast to cathedral and collegiate churches) of a distinctive Eucharistic dress is commonly held to turn upon whether, as the Judicial Committee lays down in *Clifton v. Ridsdale*, the Advertisements of 1566 are or are not to be read into the Ornaments Rubric of 1661, so that if they are to be, then such distinctive dress must be illegal, but that if they are not, then it is legal.

I must very respectfully demur to this representation; and submit that the opinion is tenable, that even if the Advertisements must be read into the Rubric (as to which I claim the most complete liberty, to reserve my historical and literary independence), still the adoption

of such dress in parish churches would not thereby be forbidden, but only the obligation of its use relaxed.

This may seem a bold position to take up, but I believe that, in spite of the research which has been bestowed, particularly in recent days, upon the legal value of the Advertisements as a whole, there has all along been a natural but unfortunate tendency to take for granted a certain traditionary interpretation of their details, which has come down from days when their meaning was supposed to lead to no practical result. I cannot therefore too earnestly insist upon the necessity of considering these details, like those of any other document, by the double aid of history as now studied, and of their own grammatical signification.

Those who place the legal value of the Advertisements at the highest, accept them as the statutable fulfilment of a certain provision of Elizabeth's Act of Uniformity of 1559; but in reading that provision they ought to quote it as a whole. In its entirety it comprises two consecutive paragraphs of the Act, and runs as follows:—

XXV. Provided always, and be it enacted, that such ornaments of the Church, and of the ministers thereof, shall be retained, and be in use, as was in this Church of England, by authority of Parliament, in the second year of the reign of King Edward the Sixth, until other order shall be therein taken by the authority of the Queen's Majesty, with the advice of her Commissioners appointed and authorised under the Great Seal of England for causes ecclesiastical, or of the Metropolitan of this Realm.

XXVI. And also, that if there shall happen any contempt or irreverence to be used in the ceremonies or rites of the Church, by the misusing of the Orders appointed in this book, the Queen's Majesty may, by the like advice of the said Commissioners or Metropolitan, ordain and publish such further ceremonies or rites as may be most for the advancement of God's glory, the edifying of His Church, and the due reverence of Christ's holy mysteries and sacraments.

The first of these two paragraphs is commonly quoted as if it comprised the entire provision; and so taken by itself it may reasonably be read as pointing to some intention of further reducing the ritual. But when both paragraphs are considered together such an interpretation becomes impossible, inasmuch as the immediate conclusion from the initial premiss is to contemplate the necessity for and to give the reasons which should lead to 'ordaining' 'further ceremonies and rites,' all necessity for and all reasons possibly leading to the retrenchment of existing ceremonies being markedly, and no doubt intentionally, omitted.

We may at once pass on to the Advertisements, which I shall, like the Judicial Committee, treat for the purpose of this memorandum as being the 'other order,' the taking of which is contemplated in those words from the Act of 1559 which I have just quoted. The Advertisements important to our inquiry are these:—

Item.—In the ministration of the holy Communion in cathedrall and collegiate churches, the principall minister shall use a cope with gospeller and epistoler agreeably; and at all other prayers to be sayde at that communion table, to use no copes but surplices.

Item.—That the deane and prebendaries weare a surplesse with a silk hooede in the quyer; and when they preache in the cathedrall or collegiate church, to weare their hooede.

Item.—That every minister sayinge any publike prayers, or ministringe the sacramentes or other rites of the church, shall wear a comely surples with sleeves, to be provided at the charges of the parishe; and that the parishe provide a decen table standing on a frame for the communion table.

From first to last I am unable to find any prohibition in these Advertisements of the ornaments which were in this Church of England by authority of Parliament in the second year of the reign of King Edward the Sixth, and which are still to be sought (as far as the ministerial dress goes) in the Rubrics of 1549. If their authors intended the declaration to be prohibitory, they might have said that the principal ministers in cathedral and collegiate churches were to wear 'copes,' but not to wear 'albes' or 'vestments,' but they do not say so. They might have laid down that while the parish was bound to provide the parson's 'surplice,' and he to wear it, the parish should be forbidden to provide 'vestment,' 'cope,' or 'albe,' and the parson also be forbidden to provide them at his own cost, or in any case to wear them, whoever might have been at charges for them.

The Advertisements might, I repeat, have said all this, and they naturally would have done so, if intended to be prohibitory. But they say nothing at all of the kind, and do not even refer to the older provisions which they are supposed to repeal. All which they say is direct and obligatory in the direction of putting on, but not of taking off. The principal minister, when there is a Communion in a cathedral or collegiate church, shall wear a cope. The Epistoler and Gospeller shall be dressed 'agreeably.' On other occasions of worship the dignitaries shall wear surplices and hoods. In parish churches the parish shall provide a surplice, and the parson shall use it.

Upon the other vestures, presumably legal up to the date of the Advertisements, they say nothing; only these are in a very delicate and dexterous way taken out of the schedule of obligatory ornaments by the constructive repeal of the obligation to procure them. Cathedral and collegiate churches were rich corporations, so they had to buy their own copes and surplices. The surplice of the less opulent parish church was to be provided at the charges of the parish—i.e. by the Church-rate, the only parochial exchequer which the law recognised—which was thereby virtually exonerated from the cost of any more expensive vesture, and at the same time kept tight to the sometimes unpopular surplice. But for this residuary limitation, the policy of the Advertisements would be the same as that which has in our time settled the Church-rate question itself. The compulsion of

Church-rates has gone; Church-rates remain. No parson was to be punished for not wearing the dress, nor yet for wearing it. Without pressing the argument too far I may observe that between the accession of Elizabeth and the Commonwealth there is direct evidence that the use of copes was in excess of the compulsion of the Advertisements in cases where no Church-rate came in to condition the acquisition of the dress, namely, in Chapels Royal and the Chapels of Colleges and Bishops' palaces, namely in *sacella*, which the most loose use of language could not include under 'Collegiate Churches.' In one case—Lincoln College, Oxford—the copes were given by that well-known Low Churchman Archbishop Williams, as visitor of the college when Bishop of Lincoln. Does not the reading of the Advertisements which I offer, straightforward and grammatical as it is, simplify a tangled episode in our Church history, an episode more than 300 years old, and still going on? If it can be accepted, there will be no need to settle the comparative force of Rubric and of Advertisement and Canon, because there will be no longer any fundamental contrariety between them. The regal sanction to the Advertisements may be received or may be rejected; and 'reading into' will be a very harmless phrase when the thing read in is in fact identical with that into which it is read. One class of provisions will express the hard absolute law as it is written, and the other the popular explanation of that law as it may be worked. The objection that in Tudor or Stuart days such a thing as ritual permission or elasticity was unknown is at once refuted by facts over which there is no dispute, and which, like the vestiary question, are connected with the Prayer Book and Canons. Every successive Prayer Book enjoins daily prayers on every minister, and yet the use of them in the vast majority of parish churches has been continuously disregarded. But there is a still stronger evidence. The Canons of 1604 (Canons 14 and 15) actually order service 'upon such days as are appointed to be kept holy by the Book of Common Prayer and upon their eves,' besides prescribing the Wednesday and Friday Litany, and are silent on daily prayers; while the Prayer Book has gone on repeating in every edition the order for the daily prayers. In fact the daily prayers of the Rubric *versus* the holy days' services and twice a week Litany of the Canon is an absolute parallel to the modicum vesture as provided in the Rubrics *versus* the modicum vesture as provided in the Advertisements and Canons. In each case a named part does not exclude the partly-named whole. The principle of the daily prayers or of the holy days' services and bi-weekly Litany is the same, that of sanctifying week days no less than Sundays by public worship. Only the more strict provision lays down ideal perfection, and the less strict one respects practical material difficulties. The same distinction rules the two classes of vestiary prescription. The Rubric which orders a distinctive Eucharistic dress in augmentation of the normal garb of ministration in every church is the ideal per-

fection. The Advertisements and Canons which limit this obligation to cathedral and collegiate churches are the concession to practical material difficulties. But this concession makes the import of the obligation within the retained area more emphatic. If the Eucharistic dress of the Rubric of 1549 symbolises, as we are so often told, unsound doctrine, still more stringently and offensively must the Eucharistic dress which the Advertisements and Canons incontestably force upon bishops and dignitaries symbolise that same unsound doctrine, which these *pralati* are in virtue of their *pralatura* commanded to set forth; for the higher placed a man is, the greater must be his responsibility. Unquestionably, then, the moral influence of a Bishop's or Dean's dress in the 'mother church' of the diocese is far more powerful than that of a Vicar or Curate in a mere parish church. The Bishop celebrating the Holy Communion in his cope at that mother church is the proxy for the whole diocese for whatever the cope used in that conjunction may or may not symbolise.

With the reciprocal concession at this stage of the inquiry that upon the face of the Advertisements either interpretation is equally plausible, we may profitably turn to history for collateral light. So I must ask who were the foes at whom the Advertisements, whether regal or only archiepiscopal in their authority, were aimed?

These foes must be sought within the Church of England, for in the eye of the law, at that date, the Church and the State of England were conterminous and identical. Were they persons, whoever they might be, who hankered after the older forms, and cherished hopes of retroceding even behind 1549? There is not the slightest hint in history of any action in any form from such agitators within the pale of the Church of England. Whatever any one may have felt, the men of reactionary activity fell off to Rome. Was it the party which sought its standpoint at 1549? No hint of any such party bestirring itself can be found except as represented by one, or at most two persons. These were Queen Elizabeth and perhaps Archbishop Parker; so by the supposition they would have launched the Advertisements against themselves. Elizabeth, moreover, was angered at the opposition directed so soon after her accession against the ceremonial of her own chapel. The party which was troublesome, discontented, and turbulent, and in the eyes of Queen and Bishops disloyal and dangerous, was that which later on was known as the Puritan—men ready to wreck Church and State rather than wear a surplice—so the Advertisements were aimed at and came down upon them as a measure of coercion, by no means sweetened by the active part which the Low Church Bishop Grindal took in working them. We know that the publication of that manifesto was to these clergymen an incitement towards further disturbances. The abundant historical evidence of the turbulent action of many of the London clergy has within these few months been vividly supplemented by the publication, by the Camden

Society, of a most interesting and graphic contemporary journal by no less an authority than John Stow, the antiquary.

Yet the ire of these bold and conscientious, but unruly men, was incited by the demand made upon them to adopt the surplice. To them the order to wear the surplice did not come as a compromise, but as the unwelcome instalment of a repulsive system. They were strong enough to cause apprehension even to so masterful a sovereign as Elizabeth, while she and Parker had to rely upon the support of the more conservative party in the Church—the party whose allegiance to the Reformed Church of England was proof against their appreciation of traditionary ceremonial leading them on to secession, but who appreciated ceremonial all the same. Is it conceivable that the authorities would have taken such an opportunity of disgusting their friends by a curt prohibition of that ceremonial, so contemptuous as not even to name that which it was forbidding? Clearly the tacit appeal to them was to rest content with the enforcement of the surplice, while other things, except in cathedrals, were to rest in virtual abeyance.

It would be a happy event for the Church of England if a more critical reading of the Advertisements could be established, so as to open the way to a peaceful and moderate *modus vivendi* upon the ceremonial debate being generally reached by the peaceable way of opinion, and without recurring to the perilous and inflammable agency of law courts or of Parliament.

I am not writing as a lawyer, and if I content myself with noting the difficulties which may arise from the special application made by the judges in *Clifton v. Ridsdale*, it is not because I undervalue it or desire to slur them over. But it does not require to be a lawyer to distinguish between the general principle and the special application. Agreement on a general principle is a most important step before adjusting special details, which are most probably different in each different case, and are, therefore, within the compass of a distinction.

A. J. B. BERESFORD HOPE.

GEORGE ELIOT.

WHEN a great writer has passed away, the published expressions of criticism, admiration, or regret are not an infallible sign of the feeling that predominates among either the writing or the reading world. There is a degree of friendly regard that expresses itself with even exaggerated fulness on such an occasion, while profounder depths of feeling take refuge in silence, or a tacit assumption that the largest claims are self-evidently just. In the case of George Eliot there is a further reason for such silence; most of those who might have been able and willing to speak in appreciation of the writer or her books are disabled by the overpowering sense of their personal loss in the death of the best of women and the best of friends.

Mr. Lewes once observed to the present writer, 'I do not think you *ought* to review her books, any more than I ought;' and many of those who are best qualified to speak of our common loss feel no doubt that criticism is impossible to them, and therefore praise should be left to more impartial or indifferent judges. But I think we should have George Eliot's authority for the view that affection may quicken as well as impair the vision, and the instinct which imposes silence on the nearest friends of a great man during his life has never acted as a bar to their letting the world know after his death what they alone are able to tell it. The present writer, indeed, has no such claim to special knowledge; all who loved and revered her whom the world calls George Eliot know equally well the qualities of mind and character and the unequalled charm of manner by which she fascinated so many and such opposite natures. Only it may be suggested that the best critics of a writer whose works exercised the same kind of influence as her personality are not those who manifest an exceptional indifference to the peculiar power of both.

It is natural to wish to begin our acquaintance with a favourite author at the earliest possible date. To do so we may turn to the motto of the fifty-seventh chapter of *Middlemarch*, in the sixth book:—

They numbered scarce eight summers when a name
Rose on their souls, and stirred such motions there
As thrill the buds and shape their hidden frame
At penetration of the quickening air:

His name who told of loyal Evan Dhu,
Of quaint Bradwardine, and Vich Ian Vor,
Making the little world their childhood knew
Large with a land of mountain, lake, and scaur,
And larger yet with wonder, love, belief,
Toward Walter Scott, who, living far away,
Sent them this wealth of joy and noble grief.
The book and they must part, but day by day,
In lines that thwart like portly spiders ran
They wrote the tale from Tully Veolan.

Somewhere about 1827 a friendly neighbour lent *Waverley* to an elder sister of little Mary Evans. It was returned before the child had read to the end, and in her distress at the loss of the fascinating volume she began to write out the story as far as she had read it for herself, beginning naturally where the story begins with *Waverley's* adventures at Tully Veolan, and continuing until the surprised elders were moved to get her the book again. Elia divided her childish allegiance with Scott, and she remembered fastening with singular pleasure upon an extract in some stray almanac from the essay in commemoration of 'Captain Jackson,' and his 'slender ration of single Gloucester,' and proverbs in praise of cheese-rind. This is an extreme example of the general rule that a wise child's taste in literature is sounder than adults generally venture to believe.

Not many years later we may imagine her a growing girl at school. Almost on the outskirts of the old town of Coventry, towards the railway station, the house may still be seen, itself an old-fashioned five-windowed Queen Anne sort of dwelling, with a shell-shaped cornice over the door, with an old timbered cottage facing it, and near adjoining a quaint brick-and-timber building, with an oriel window thrown out upon oak pillars. Between forty and fifty years ago, Methodist ladies kept the school, and the name of 'little mamma,' given by her schoolfellows, is a proof that already something was to be seen of the maternal air which characterised her in later years, and perhaps more especially in intercourse with her own sex. Prayer-meetings were in vogue among the girls, following the example of their elders, and while taking no doubt a leading part in these, she used to suffer much self-reproach about her coldness and inability to be carried away with the same enthusiasm as others. At the same time nothing was further from her nature than any sceptical inclination, and she used to pounce with avidity upon any approach to argumentative theology within her reach, carrying Paley's *Evidences* up to her bedroom, and devouring it as she lay upon the floor alone.

It is seldom that a mind of so much power is so free from the impulse to dissent, and that not from too ready credulousness, but rather because the consideration of doubtful points was habitually crowded out, as one may say, by the more ready and delighted

acceptance of whatever accredited facts and doctrines might be received unquestioningly. We can imagine George Eliot in youth, burning to master all the wisdom and learning of the world; we cannot imagine her failing to acquire any kind of knowledge on the pretext that her teacher was in error about something else than the matter in hand, and it is undoubtedly to this natural preference for the positive side of things that we are indebted for the singular breadth and completeness of her knowledge and culture. A mind like hers must have preyed disastrously upon itself during the years of comparative solitude in which she lived at Foleshill, had it not been for that inexhaustible source of delight in every kind of intellectual acquisition. Languages, music, literature, science, and philosophy interested her alike: it was early in this period that in the course of a walk with a friend she paused and clasped her hands with a wild aspiration that she might live 'to reconcile the philosophy of Locke and Kant!' Years afterwards she remembered the very turn of the road where she had spoken it.

Before she was twenty she wrote verses like other youths, but the silence (as to original production) which lasted more than fifteen years after that date was owing to a characteristic mixture of intense ambition and diffidence. She did not choose herself, indeed she thought it wrong to

Dull the world's sense with mediocrity,

and she was resolved to do nothing (except the homely duties she held sacred) unless she could do what was excellent. The translation of Strauss and the translation of Spinoza's *Ethics* were undertaken, not by her own choice but at the call of friendship; in the first place to complete what some one else was unable to continue, and in the second to make the philosopher she admired accessible to a friendly phrenologist who did not read Latin. At all times she regarded translation as a work that should be undertaken as a duty, to make accessible any book that required to be read, and though undoubtedly she was satisfied that the *Leben Jesu* required to be read in England, it would be difficult to imagine a temper more naturally antipathetic to her than that of its author; and critics who talk about the 'Strauss and Feuerbach period' should be careful to explain that the phrase covers no implication that she was at any time an admirer or a disciple of Strauss. There are extremes not only too remote but too disparate to be included in the same life.

In 1849 Miss Evans lost the father to whom her life had been devoted from the time she was sixteen. Two or three years later she was induced by Dr. Chapman to undertake some share in the conduct of the *Westminster Review*; but excellent as her work of this kind was, the task of criticism was distasteful to her, and though she admitted the usefulness of such work, it was a relief to her to give it up.

She preferred accepting what was valuable in a book as it stood to elaborating a statement of how and why it was valuable, and in addition to this natural disinclination for the reviewer's work, she had an almost exaggeratedly scrupulous sense of responsibility, which contributed to make it laborious to her. But that it is unreasonable to expect all work equally from the same hands, we might be tempted to regret that she has not given us more criticism like her review of Lecky's *Rationalism* in the first number of the *Fortnightly*, and the article in the *Westminster* (January 1857), on 'Worldliness and Other-worldliness' *apropos* of Dr. Young of the *Night Thoughts*. It is a culpable indiscretion, of the sort most unwelcome to George Eliot, to disinter what an author has wished to have forgotten, but when there is no immaturity of expression, and when we know the thought to have remained unchanged, it is a lawful indulgence to quote what is not now generally accessible—at least one passage giving her opinion upon a subject as to which it was often asked. She is commenting on Young's lines:

'As in the dying parent dies the child,
Virtue with Immortality expires.
Who tells me he denies his soul immortal,
Whate'er his boast, has told me he's a knave.'

We can imagine the man who 'denies his soul immortal' replying: It is quite possible that *you* would be a knave, and love yourself alone, if it were not for your belief in immortality, but you are not to force upon me what would result from your own utter want of moral emotion. . . . I am honest, because I don't like to inflict evil on others in this life, not because I'm afraid of evil to myself in another. The fact is, I do *not* love myself alone, whatever logical necessity there may be for that in your mind. . . . It is a pain to me to witness the suffering of a fellow-being, and I feel his suffering the more acutely because he is *mortal*, because his life is so short, and I would have it, if possible, filled with happiness and not misery. Through my union and fellowship with the men and women I *have* seen, I feel a like, though a fainter, sympathy with those I *have not* seen; and I am able so to live in imagination with the generations to come, that their good is not alien to me, and is a stimulus to me to labour for ends which may not benefit myself but will benefit them. . . . And I should say, that if you feel no motive to common morality but your fear of a criminal law in heaven, you are decidedly a man for the police on earth to keep their eye upon, since it is a matter of world-old experience that fear of distant consequences is a very insufficient barrier against the rush of immediate desire. . . . And in opposition to your theory that a belief in immortality is the only source of virtue, I maintain that, in so far as moral action is dependent on that belief, so far the emotion which prompts it is not truly moral,¹ is still in the stage of egoism, and has not yet attained the higher development of sympathy. In proportion as a man would care less for the rights and welfare of his fellow, if he did not believe in a future life, in that proportion is he wanting in the genuine feelings of justice and benevolence; as the musician who would care less to play a sonata of Beethoven finely in solitude than in public, where he was to be paid for it, is wanting in genuine enthusiasm for music.

Then after conceding that the 'other-worldly' emotions dwelt upon by Young may depend on this belief, she continues:—

¹ Cf. Newman to Kingsley, 'Why, "*for its own sake*" belongs to the very idea of virtue.'

But for certain other elements of virtue which are of more obvious importance to untheological minds—a delicate sense of our neighbour's rights, an active participation in the joys and sorrows of our fellowmen, a magnanimous acceptance of privation or suffering for ourselves when it is the condition of good to others, in a word, the extension and intensification of our sympathetic nature—we think it of some importance to contend that they have no more direct relation to the belief in a future state than the interchange of gases in the lungs has to the plurality of worlds. Nay, to us it is conceivable that in some minds the deep pathos lying in thoughts of human mortality—that we are here for a little while and then vanish away; that this earthly life is all that is given to our loved ones and to our many suffering fellowmen—lies nearer the foundations of moral emotion than the conception of extended existence. And surely it ought to be a welcome fact if the thought of *mortality*, as well as of immortality, be favourable to virtue. . . . To us it is matter of rejoicing that this latter necessity of healthful life is independent of theological ink, and that its evolution is ensured in the interaction of human souls as certainly as the evolution of science and art, with which, indeed, it is but a twin ray, melting into them with undefinable limits.

These passages are probably prior in date to the writer's familiarity with the works of Comte, and they explain the bent of mind which led her to welcome with 'reverence and gratitude' his earlier political and philosophical writings and to prefer permanently that her 'feelings of this order should be exaggerated in the conception of the public rather than that she should be ranked with those who are admired for the cheap wisdom of dissidence.'

It is of course interesting to possess George Eliot's opinions as to other women novelists, written before she was silenced by her own greater fame. As an artist, she wrote in 1852, Miss Austen surpasses all the male novelists that ever lived, and for eloquence and depth of feeling no man approaches George Sand. But in general the literature of women 'may be compared to that of Rome—a literature of imitation;' and she insists both in this article and in one on a kindred subject, some years later, on the importance rather of recognising and using to vary and extend the range of literature, whatever specific differences there might be in the perceptions and intuitions of men and women. It may be doubted, however, whether, notwithstanding such clue, and the confident divination of Dickens, if the secret of George Eliot's sex had been preserved, opinion would not have remained divided on the subject. We have heard of a canny Yorkshire man, rejoicing in the possession of an odd volume of *Adam Bede*, who declined altogether to credit the assurances of a too well-informed tourist that his favourite book was written by a woman: there was the gentleman's name for one thing, and besides, how could a woman know what the men were thinking of? The other articles are, it need hardly be said, careful and thorough, only with too much subordination of the writer to the subject in hand (e.g. the 'Life of George Forster') to supply much of personal interest, except perhaps the one on Madame de Sablé, whose foibles are handled with pretty and characteristic indulgence.

In 1854 Miss Evans found what had been wanting to her loving

and generous nature since her father's death—some one 'whose life would have been worse without her.' In return we owe to Mr. Lewes 'the complete works of George Eliot, not one of which would have been written or even planned without the inspiriting influence of his constant encouragement, his obvious, unfeigned, unforced delight in her powers and success, his total freedom from—we will not say jealousy—but the least inclination towards self-comparison: even more might be said, but to say more would be to quote words which were not written to be published. It is needless now to guard such statements against the misinterpretation satirised in *Middlemarch*, where we read, of Fred's and Mary's authorship, how Middlemarch satisfied itself 'that there was no need to praise anybody for writing a book, because it was always done by somebody else.' Mr. Lewes had written novels, and Miss Evans had translated German books; therefore when George Eliot published stories and Mr. Lewes a *Life of Goethe*, the critics of the day agreed, with the worthies of Middlemarch, that each was inspired by the other, and so the work of neither ought to count for much. But it will not be out of place to acknowledge a further obligation. It is the snare of versatile and sympathetic natures to feel almost as if they themselves were convinced by the opinions held by those with whom they sympathise for reasons they have taken pains to understand. Mrs. Lewes was conscious of a temptation to agree too readily under such circumstances, to identify herself as it were dramatically with the views she did not really share, and she acknowledged a debt of gratitude to Mr. Lewes for his scrupulous anxiety that she should not be biassed in that way by him. He was careful to guard her mental independence even against her own too great readiness to defer to another, even though that other might be himself.

Such obligations as these can be mentioned; it is scarcely possible, without intruding on the sanctity of private life, to allude to the perfect union between those two, which lent half its charm to all worship paid at the shrine of George Eliot. She herself has spoken somewhere of the element of almost maternal tenderness in a man's protecting love: this patient, unwearying care for which no trifles are too small, watched over her own life; he stood between her and the world, he relieved her from all those minor cares which chafe and fret the artist's soul; he wrote her letters (a proceeding for which he would say laughingly her correspondents were *not* grateful); in a word, he so smoothed the course of her outer life as to leave all her powers free to do what she alone could do for the world and for the many who looked to her for help and guidance. No doubt this devotion brought its own reward, but we are exacting for our idols and do not care to have even a generous error to condone, and therefore we are glad to know that great as his reward was, it was no greater than was merited by the most faithful perfect love that ever crowned a woman's life.

All those who pleased themselves by giving that name to their love and admiration were content to know that their devotion was welcome to the one whose devotion exceeded theirs—their fellow-worshipper, George Henry Lewes, who counted it, I think, for his chief glory to take the lead in this cult. And here let us encounter what has been said or whispered by some who knew that George Eliot was the centre of a throng of ardent worshippers, and doubted perhaps, in Baconian phrase, whether it was possible to love and be wise, or, at all events, to be wise in loving with the unreserved enthusiasm of admiration common to those for whom George Eliot was the one woman in the world, the ‘throned lady whose colours they wore between their heart and their armour.’ It is not usual for men or women to be called on to justify in words their strongest feelings of personal attachment. These are usually accepted as an ultimate fact, and when we see such feelings subsisting with unwonted strength between two otherwise commonplace individuals, we conclude that they cannot both be wholly commonplace, since one or other must have an exceptional power of loving or inspiring love. In like manner, let us be content to know that if George Eliot was the object of much passionate and romantic worship, it was because her nature was so framed as to subdue to this same result numerous and very diverse characters. Men and women, old friends and new, persons of her own age and of another generation, the married and the single, impulsive lovers and hard-headed philosophers, nay, even some who elsewhere might have passed for cynics, all classes alike yielded to the attractive force of this rare character, in which tenderness and strength were blended together and as it were transfused with something that was all her own—the genius of sweet goodness.

Now, if we admit as to the objective side of a character that its *esse* is *percipi* (and any other view is hard to establish), it follows that (George Eliot *was* what she appeared to this band of worshippers. It has been suggested that this worship was a fashion that had to be adopted for the sake of uniformity by all acquaintances; but the conjecture shows how little, after all, was understood of the intense feeling she inspired. The commonplaces of superficial admiration can be picked up and repeated at the call of fashion; but Mrs. Lewes was accustomed to hear, and her worshippers to speak, another language, which cannot be borrowed at will, and, to do her acquaintances justice, few or none of them were rash enough to play the hypocrite before so keen a judge. But another doubt too has been hinted at. The rôle of idol is a trying one to play: granted that George Eliot’s worshippers had all reason on their side at first, does not so much incense end by becoming in some sort a necessity to its recipient?

In friendship George Eliot had the unconscious exactingness of a full nature. She was intolerant of a vacuum in the mind or character, and she was indifferent to admiration that did not seem to have its

root in fundamental agreement with those first principles she held to be most 'necessary to salvation.' Where this sympathy existed, her generous affection was given to a fellow-believer, a fellow-labourer, with singularly little reference to the fact that such full sympathy was never unattended with profound love and reverence for herself as a living witness to the truth and power of the principles thus shared. To love her was a strenuous pleasure, for in spite of the tenderness for all human weakness that was natural to her, and the scrupulous charity of her overt judgments, the fact remained that her natural standard was ruthlessly out of reach, and it was a painful discipline for her friends to feel that she was compelled to lower it to suit their infirmities. The intense humility of her self-appreciation, and the unfeigned readiness with which she would even herself with any sinner who sought her counsel, had the same effect upon those who could compare what she condemned in herself with what she tolerated in them. And at the same time, no doubt, this total absence of self-sufficiency had something to do with the passionate tenderness with which commonplace people dared to cherish their immortal friend.

It is scarcely possible that a sect of fanatics should have developed itself by a spontaneous identical mistake in all parts of the world at once, that enthusiasts with a bent towards unreasonable adoration should have agreed in professing the same feeling for the same object without a common sufficient cause. The enthusiasts, at all events, are satisfied with the solution of the problem given in *The Spanish Gipsy*:—

But is it what we love, or how we love,
That makes true good ?

Oh, subtlety ! for me

'Tis what I love determines how I love.

The goddess with pure rites reveals herself

And makes pure worship.

It may be said of almost all love that it is deserved by those who are able to inspire it continuously, and reasons neither need nor should be given for such merely private feeling. But many of George Eliot's friends were first attracted to her by admiration for her writings, and though some of these ended by putting even her writings in the second place, the double intercourse with herself and her works was so far intermingled that explanation is possible up to a certain point.

We are conscious in her works of a many-sided sympathy with the various phases of real existence, with its commonest experiences as well as with its finest emotions, together with a keen intelligence of the laws which regulate, and the general truths which bear upon, the best and worst possibilities of human life. In like manner, her character seemed to include every possibility of action and emotion : no human passion was wanting in her nature, there were no blanks or negations ; and the marvellous thing was to see how, in this wealth of impulses and desires, there was no crash of internal discord, no

painful collisions with other human interests outside; how, in all her life, passions of volcanic strength were harnessed in the service of those nearest her, and so inspired by the permanent instinct of devotion to her kind, that it seemed as if it were by their own choice they spent themselves there only where their force was welcome. Her very being was a protest against the opposing and yet cognate heresies that half the normal human passions must be strangled in the quest of virtue, and that the attainment of virtue is a dull and undesirable end, seeing it implies the sacrifice of most that makes life interesting. She was intolerant of those who find life dull as well as of those who find their fellow-creatures unattractive, and both for the same reason, holding that such indifference was due to the lack of vital energy and generosity in the complainer, since the same world held interests enough for those who had enough impulses and affections of their own whereby to entangle themselves in its affairs. But though she set herself chiefly to preach the worth of common things, the admirableness of obscure good deeds, the value of common lives, and the sacredness of commonplace people in the crisis of the great primitive emotions, though she preached thus to the conviction of her hearers and her readers, there was reserved for her friends another experience, not indeed invalidating the other doctrine, but supplementing it with a truth she did not preach. If ordinary folks, with but mediocre powers of intelligence and attraction, were deserving of affection and respect—even from herself—could any intensity of such feelings transcend what was due to one who rose as far as she did above this margin of mediocrity within which she thought the choicest feelings of our nature might find ample food? To be content with the rest of the world, and to have her to adore *par-dessus le marché*, was a happiness she gave to many, perhaps to some who without her might have remained entangled in the heresies she condemned. And I think the world, in counting what it owes her, should not forget the welcome reminder given by her life, that the level of respectable mediocrity, which we are not suffered to despise, may yet be broken for us by the advent of an ideal nature whose rare powers and yet more rare unselfishness create anew the impressions to which the language of religion owes its birth, οὐτοί ἀνευ Θεοῦ.

And in this context it may be well to consider the much-debated question whether the general impression left by her writings, the general tendency of her teaching, is melancholy or otherwise. It follows from what has been said that the consolations she had to offer were of a strenuous sort. She came as a very angel of consolation to those persons of sufficiently impartial mind to find comfort in the hint that the world might be less to blame than they were as to those points on which they found themselves in chronic disagreement with it. But she had nothing welcome for those whose idea of consolation is the promise of a *deus ex machinâ* by whose help they may gather

grapes of thorns and figs of thistles. She thought that there was much needed doing in the world, and criticism of our neighbours and the natural order might wait at all events until the critic's own character and conduct were free from blame. Imperfect agents might lend a hand in mending what was amiss, it was only unhelpful criticism that stirred her anger; and the observation may have been present to her mind that people usually have a sneaking kindness for their own handiwork, even while it continues to fall short of the desired perfection. One who does not care for china in itself will survey with complacency a neatly mended fracture, and her severity in this direction must have been due to the perception that long orations upon the evils of creation proceed most readily from the lips of those who are otherwise at little pains to lessen the evils. To a friend who once playfully called her optimist she responded, 'I will not answer to the name of optimist, but if you like to invent Meliorist, I will not say you call me out of my name.' She felt so strongly that there was a worse and a better, almost at every turn in every life; and this being so, since it was in the power of human beings again and again to help each other to prefer and reach the better, the continuous passive dwelling upon all the possibilities of evil, whether in resentment or despair, assumed in her eyes the shape of a folly closely verging on crime.

Of course sincere and industrious reformers may suffer from melancholy as well as more cynical pessimists, and to such infirmity she could be tender enough, but in herself or others she gave the name of weakness to the unmotivated depression which leads some people to do all their doings sadly. Her own view of the world as a whole was too veracious to be summed up in a phrase. Her mind was a mirror, upon which the truth concerning all human relations was reflected with literal fidelity. What one generalisation can cover so wide a range? You can no more draw one moral lesson from her books than you can from life itself; you may draw a thousand if you will, but merely to read one of her books in an impressionable mood is to see such a portion of the world with her eyes and to share in the multiform influence exercised by the vision. The mind unconsciously becomes attuned to the set of ideas by which all her single perceptions were dominated and explained, and without having drawn a single inference in thought, the reader is lured into the mood which, become permanent in a sweet woman of genius, inspires the writer and the friend we mourn.

Before the publication of the *Scenes of Clerical Life*, Mrs. Lewes (for George Eliot as yet was not) had written nothing of the same kind, except a description of a village, which, with the reticence we have many reasons for regretting, was never afterwards published. From that day to this her writings have been subjected to much criticism, some good, some bad, and some indifferent after the

manner of the day, and though, perhaps, none have been completely satisfactory, or worthy of their subject from a literary point of view, the time has not come for us to wish to have the want supplied. Many who, while George Eliot lived and wrote, thought only of her books, may now be inclined to search her books not merely for the familiar characters, scenes, or epigrams, but also in the hope of discerning those passages in which the writer's self is speaking, not merely through the actors of her drama, but more or less clearly in her own person.

It is in the *Scenes of Clerical Life* more especially that the interestingness of commonplace lives is insisted on; the doctrine is defended in passages too numerous to quote, and its truth is demonstrated by each story as a whole, seeing that the interest they inspire is in about an inverse ratio to the presence of the ordinary elements of romance. The ground of appeal is rather that

these commonplace people—many of them—bear a conscience, and have felt the sublime prompting to do the painful right; they have their unspoken sorrows, and their sacred joys; their hearts have perhaps gone out towards their first-born, and they have mourned over the irreclaimable dead. Nay, is there not a pathos in their very insignificance, in our comparison of their dim and narrow existence with the glorious possibilities of that human nature which they share?

And this charitable divination is called on to act retrospectively:—

To those who were familiar only with the grey-haired vicar, jogging leisurely along on his old chestnut cob, it would perhaps have been hard to believe that he had ever been the Maynard Gilfil who, with a heart full of passion and tenderness, had urged his black Kitty to her swiftest gallop on the way to Callam, or that the old gentleman of caustic tongue, and bucolic tastes, and sparing habits, had known all the deep secrets of devoted love, had struggled through its days and nights of anguish, and trembled under its unspeakable joys. And, indeed, the Mr. Gilfil of those late Shepperton days had more of the knots and ruggedness of poor human nature than there lay any clear hint of in the open-eyed loving Maynard. But it is with men as with trees; if you lop off their finest branches, into which they were pouring their young life-juice, the wounds will be healed over with some rough boss, some odd excrescence; and what might have been a grand tree, expanding into liberal shade, is but a whimsical misshapen trunk. Many an irritating fault, many an unlovely oddity, has come of a hard sorrow, which has crushed and maimed the nature just when it was expanding into plenteous beauty; and the trivial erring life which we visit with our harsh blame may be but as the unsteady motion of a man whose best limb is withered.

In *Janet's Repentance*, besides the history of the central figure, the writer dwells with lingering pathos on the last faint traces of human goodness in a brutalised nature, and recurs again and again to the special claim of earnest and conscientious labours to at least the same measure of intelligent tolerance and sympathy as has been already extorted on behalf of lower natures:—

It is apt to be so in this life, I think. While we are coldly discussing a man's career, sneering at his mistakes, blaming his rashness, and labelling his opinions, that man, in his solitude, is perhaps shedding hot tears because his sacrifice is a

hard one, because strength and patience are failing him to speak the difficult word, and do the difficult deed. . . . Yet surely, surely the only true knowledge of our fellow-man is that which enables us to feel with him, which gives us a fine ear for the heart-pulses that are beating under the mere clothes of circumstance and opinion. Our subtlest analysis of schools and sects must miss the essential truth, unless it be lit up by the love that sees in all forms of human thought and work the life-and-death struggles of separate human beings.

George Eliot's charity sets limits to itself, and she does not shrink from reprobating the intolerant stupidity which has power to wound while it can hardly help even its friends. It is said of Mr. Tryan: 'However strong his consciousness of right, he found it no stronger armour against such weapons as derisive glances and virulent words than against stones and clubs: his conscience was in repose, but his sensibility was bruised.' And the mass of ordinary folks may be reminded of the responsibility attached to this power of heedlessly wounding those whom they may yet come to recognise as their best friends. It might be said of men and women, with a wider fame than that of the Milby curate:

It was one of the weaknesses of his nature to be too keenly alive to every harsh wind of opinion; to wince under the frowns of the foolish; to be irritated by the injustice of those who could not possibly have the elements indispensable for judging him rightly; and with this acute sensibility to blame, this dependence on sympathy, he had for years been constrained into a position of antagonism. . . . He had often been thankful to an old woman for saying, 'God bless you;' to a little child for smiling at him; to a dog for submitting to be patted by him.

Only an obtuse reader of George Eliot's books can fail to discern traces in the author's self of an intensely—just not morbidly—acute sensibility. In one of her later works she speaks of 'the feeling of repulsed tenderness that is almost more of a sensation than an emotion;' and it takes little imagination to divine how, in the earlier years of such a woman, the common causes of indifference, shyness, obtuseness, or carelessness, as well as more rare ill-will or misconstruction, must have made this painful sensation only too familiar. And yet we need not travel beyond her published writings to feel also that this experience has been powerless to chill or to restrain the generous impulses of tenderness or trust. On the contrary, it is in her later works, perhaps most of all in *Middlemarch*, that she ventures to give the largest space—while keeping within the limits of obvious probability—to the power of one character over another, a power of which the first condition is the ability to put on one side the consciousness of any personal hurt or slight, and join with the other soul in considering only its present feelings and its present good.

Adam Bede is perhaps the most purely objective of her works, the one in which it is least possible to recognise the writer's self in any part of either of her characters. But if we look beyond the subtle analysis of character and passion and the fascinating idealisation

of rustic humour, the same profound sympathy, the same tolerant knowledge as inspires the rare sentences of reflection, will be found underlying every passage in the drama. But probably most readers feel that the interest of the work culminates in the remarkable pages before the charming scene in which Lisbeth rouses Adam to the consciousness of his new love—a passage quoted by the reviewer in *Blackwood*, whose appreciation of the finer and less obvious shades of meaning was gratefully acknowledged by her:—

For Adam, though you see him quite master of himself, working hard and delighting in his work, after his inborn, inalienable nature, had not outlived his sorrow—had not felt it slip from him as a temporary burden and leave him the same man again. Do any of us? God forbid. It would be a poor result of all our anguish and our wrestling if we won nothing but our old selves at the end of it; if we could return to the same blind loves, the same self-confident blame, the same frivolous gossip over blighted human lives, the same feeble sense of that Unknown towards which we have sent forth irrepressible cries in our loneliness. Let us rather be thankful that our knowledge lives in us as an indestructible force, only changing its form, as forces do, and passing from pain into sympathy—the one poor word which includes all our best insight and our best love. Not that this transformation of pain into sympathy had completely taken place in Adam yet; there was still a great remnant of pain, and this he felt would subsist as long as *her* pain was not a memory, but an existing thing, which he must think of as renewed with the light of every new morning. But we get accustomed to mental as well as bodily pain, without, for all that, losing our sensibility to it: it becomes a habit of our lives, and we cease to imagine a condition of perfect ease as possible for us. Desire is chastened into submission, and we are contented with our day when we have been able to bear our grief and act as if we were not suffering. For it is at such periods that *the sense of our lives having visible and invisible relations beyond any of which either our present or prospective self is the centre grows like a muscle that we are obliged to lean on and exert.*

That is a base and selfish, even a blasphemous, spirit which rejoices and is thankful over the past evil that has blighted or crushed another, because it has been made a source of unforeseen good to ourselves; Adam could never cease to mourn over that mystery of human sorrow which had been brought so close to him; he could never thank God for another's misery. . . . But it is not ignoble to feel that the fuller life which a sad experience has brought us is worth our own personal share of the pain; surely it is not possible to feel otherwise any more than it would be possible for a man with cataract to regret the painful process by which his dim blurred sight of men as trees walking had been exchanged for clear outline and effulgent day. The growth of higher feeling within us is like the growth of faculty, bringing with it a sense of added strength; we can no more wish to return to a narrower sympathy than a painter or musician can wish to return to his cruder manner, or a philosopher to his less complete formula.

In *The Mill on the Floss* the action runs more nearly upon lines which have had their parallel in the author's thought and feeling, but we ought not to exaggerate the parallelism, especially since such exaggeration is an implicit charge of transgression against the 'duteous reticences' spoken of in *Theophrastus*. Read by the light of the really autobiographic sonnets, 'Brother and Sister,' even the tragic passages in poor little Maggie's childhood appear less painful; one is apt to undervalue the compensations, the mere increment of

happiness, that comes from the 'sweet skill of loving much.' But in this book the moral problems, as to which so many readers desire chiefly to know George Eliot's thoughts, are more nearly discussed, the writer's own judgment more nearly delivered in express terms, than in any of her other works. No didactic purpose is obtruded, but here, more than anywhere else, the crisis of the story turns upon the question in one of the actor's minds: What *ought* I to do?

Every one to whom George Eliot is a moralist as well as a storyteller knows the spirit of the answer given, and criticism has a clumsy look when it attempts to supply a formula which the artist has not seen fit to construct. We know in general terms that George Eliot believed the force of moral obligation to lie in the keen personal *feeling* of the claims and needs of others, while the influence of such general rules of conduct as are commonly accepted seems in her mind associated rather with a sort of reverential custom than with the 'categorical imperative' of speculation. No personal bent is accepted as virtuous unless in the human relations of life it brings forth the fruits of virtue; a passion that exists by natural bias apart from justifying conditions is the one form of passion for which she has little sympathy to show.

We see this in her treatment of the cherished quality, constancy and 'faithfulness,' which

mean something else besides doing what is easiest and pleasantest to ourselves. They mean renouncing whatever is opposed to the reliance others have in us—whatever would cause misery to those whom the course of our lives has made dependent on us.

Contrast with this the estimate of mere unchangeableness in *Daniel Deronda*:—

We object less to be taxed with the enslaving excess of our passions than with our deficiency in wider passion; but, if the truth were known, our reputed intensity is often the dulness of not knowing what else to do with ourselves. Tannhäuser, one suspects, was a knight of ill-furnished imagination, hardly of larger discourse than a heavy guardsman; Merlin had seen his best days, and was merely repeating himself when he fell into that hopeless captivity; and we know that Ulysses felt so manifest an *ennui* under similar circumstances that Calypso herself furthered his departure.

The kind of faithfulness after which poor Maggie struggles vainly is exemplified by Mary Garth's not quite effortless constancy to her boyish lover.

When a tender affection has been storing itself in us through many of our years, the idea that we could accept any exchange for it seems to be a cheapening of our lives. And we can set a watch over our affections and our constancy as we can over other treasures.

It was not the least among George Eliot's personal fascinations that opposite qualities appeared in her, each developed to an extent that might at first sight have seemed incompatible with even

moderate indulgence of its opposite. Conservatism—the affectionate clinging of memory and affections to the past—is less a principle than an instinct with her; from the pretty touch of feeling which makes Silas Marner prop up his broken pitcher in its accustomed corner, to her own utterance ‘I love the very stones the better, the longer I have known them,’ there is nothing but tender constancy in her frequent moods of *Looking Backward*. But joined with this constitutional conservatism there was an inexhaustible freshness of susceptibility to every new impression, a readiness to respond to every new appeal, to enter into every new interest and welcome every new affection. There was room in that large soul for the love of both past and present; the relations of retrospective reverence and present service, each had a wide enough world of its own, created for itself. Few persons perhaps have recognised so many claims, yet none of them found themselves ‘crowded or jostled in her affections.’

But, to return to the moral problems of *The Mill on the Floss*. The writer’s most general conclusion is that almost every situation has a right of its own, that there is no royal road even to the discernment of what is really right, but that the guiding intuition comes from an upright, unselfish life, which enables the determining motive—of consideration for the good of others—to act predominately at last upon the inmost feelings, without whose co-operation even right action is little more than uncertain and laboured affectation:—

The great problem of the shifting relation between passion and duty is clear to no man who is capable of apprehending it: the question whether the moment has come in which a man has fallen below the possibility of a renunciation that will carry any efficacy, and must accept the sway of a passion against which he had struggled as a trespass, is one for which we have no master key that will fit all cases. The casuists have become a by-word of reproach; but their perverted spirit of minute discrimination was the shadow of a truth to which eyes and heart are too often fatally sealed; the truth, that moral judgments must remain false and hollow, unless they are checked and enlightened by a perpetual reference to the special circumstances that mark the individual lot.

All people of broad, strong sense have an instinctive repugnance to the man of maxims; because such people early discern that the mysterious complexity of our life is not to be embraced by maxims, and that to lace ourselves up in formulae of that sort is to repress all the divine promptings and inspirations that spring from growing insight and sympathy. And the man of maxims is the popular representative of the minds that are guided in their moral judgment solely by general rules, thinking that these will lead them to justice by a ready-made patent method, without the trouble of exerting patience, discrimination, impartiality—without any care to assure themselves whether they have the insight that comes from a hard-earned estimate of temptation, or from a life vivid and intense enough to have created a wide fellow-feeling with all that is human.

All her works abound in acute psychological interpretations of the subtle impressions out of which the belief in supernatural spiritual influences is woven; as in the case of Mr. Tulliver’s dim feeling—that if he were hard upon his sister it might somehow tend to make Tom hard upon Maggie at some distant day . . . for simple people like our friend Mr. Tulliver

are apt to clothe unimpeachable feelings in erroneous ideas, and this was his confused way of explaining to himself that his love and anxiety for 'the little wench' had given him a new sensibility towards his sister.

And so of Dinah's leadings it is said :—

Do we not all agree to call rapid thought and noble impulse by the name of inspiration? After our subtlest analysis of the mental powers, we must still say, as Dinah did, that our highest thoughts and our best deeds are all given to us.

But it is in *Silas Marner* that the real power of this superstition of the feelings is dwelt upon with most insistence and sympathy. The dim theological confabulations of Silas and Dolly have a point lent them by that vivid presentation of all that is acting on their consciousness, which makes this one of the writer's master-pieces :—

'There's things as we can niver make out the rights on. And all as we've got to do is to trusten, Master Marner, to do the right thing as fur as we know, and to trusten. For if us, as knows so little, can see a bit o' good and rights, we may be sure as there's a good and a rights bigger nor what we can know—I feel it i' my own inside as it must be so. And if you could but ha' gone on trustening, Master Marner, you wouldn't ha' run away from your fellow-creatures and been so lone.'

'Ah, but that 'ud ha' been hard,' said Silas, in an undertone; 'it 'ud ha' been hard to trusten then.'

'And so it would,' said Dolly, almost with compunction; 'them things are easier said nor done; and I'm partly ashamed o' talking.'

'Nay, nay,' said Silas, 'you're i' the right, Mrs. Winthrop, you're i' the right. There's good i' this world; I've a feeling o' that now, and it makes a man feel as there's a good more nor he can see, i' spite o' the trouble and the wickedness. That drawing o' the lots is dark, but the child was sent to me; there's dealings with us—there's dealings.'

It is easier to feel than to find exact words to describe the suggestions of the passage where she described, 'not without an inward sob over its symbolism,' the bewildered eagerness with which the weaver

looked out on that narrow prospect round the stone pits, listening and gazing, not with hope, but with mere yearning and unrest. . . . He stood and listened, and gazed for a long while; there was really something on the road coming towards him then, but he caught no sign of it; and the stillness and the wide trackless snow seemed to narrow his solitude, and touched his yearning with the chill of despair. . . . We see no white-winged angels now. But yet men are led away from threatening destruction; a hand is put into theirs, which leads them forth gently towards a calm and bright land, so that they look no more backward; and the hand may be a little child's.

A clearer intuition of the course of spiritual causation is given by the series of scenes than by the most unexceptionable of moralisings: the native *piety*, which will attach itself to inanimate objects rather than perish altogether, is made familiar to us before we are called upon to see the hand of some plain fate or providence in the deliverance that follows when the piety finds and welcomes a fitting object for itself again. This recognition of the deep sense in which men are their own and each other's providences has its share in inspiring the passionate fervour with which George Eliot welcomes every mani-

festation of common human goodness. After confessing to some moments of hypocritical assent to those select natures who concur in the experience that all great men are over-estimated and all small men insupportable, she says (in *Adam Bede*):—

I herewith discharge my conscience and declare that I have had quite enthusiastic movements of admiration towards old gentlemen who spoke the worst English, who were occasionally fretful in their temper, and who had never moved in a higher sphere of influence than that of parish overseer; and that the way in which I have come to the conclusion that human nature is loveable—the way I have learnt something of its deep pathos, its sublime mysteries—has been by living a great deal among people more or less commonplace and vulgar, of whom you would perhaps have heard nothing very surprising, if you were to inquire about them in the neighbourhoods where they dwelt.

The commonest acts of human kindness assume in her eyes a sacredness out of all proportion to their apparent merit or effect, because it is from such chance wayside springs that now and again a worn-out traveller quenches his mortal thirst, while every passer-by goes on refreshed. And side by side with this sense of the incalculable effects that may follow from a single act, or from ‘one of those small leavings-undone that make a great difference to other lives,’ there was present a sort of religious awe of the unseen power, made by interlacing streams of righteous influence and overshadowing even the lives that seem most forlorn.

Looked at from a sufficient distance, there is a certain temptation to group together the three next works—*Romola*, *Felix Holt*, and *The Spanish Gipsy*—notwithstanding their conspicuous differences of form and subject. The undercurrent of thought flows along another channel. The mental attitude is the same, but the familiar world is viewed in a fresh aspect. The prevailing impression is less that of the bearing of single lives upon each other and of the bearing of the widest spiritual facts on single lives, than of the degree in which the duty of individuals may be conditioned, and the fortunes of individuals shaped, by the visible forces of national history and external obligation. In *Romola* the acceptance of a wider duty gives meaning and purpose to a life that has missed its private good, but *Romola* takes her place among Florentines in virtue of the positive womanly sympathies whose exercise is needed as well as the transfigured patriotism which played so large a part in Savonarola’s religion. In *Felix Holt* and *The Spanish Gipsy*, more than in any of her other writings, there is the suggestion of some outward force, some external, constraining rule, limiting the natural freedom of the passions, and creating fresh susceptibilities for a scrupulous morality to respect. In the one case class loyalty, in the other loyalty of race, serve to symbolise this embodiment of an external consciousness; in each case it is possible to see in the feelings, which make desertion wear the aspect of a crime, an illustration of the wider obligations of

mere human fellowship. The temper of the unworldly radical is that of Zarca :—

So abject are the men whose blood we share,
Untutored, unbefriended, unendowed ;
No favourites of Heaven, or of men.
Therefore I cling to them ! Therefore no lure
Shall draw me to disown them, or forsake
The meagre wandering herd that lows for help
And needs me for its guide, to seek my pasture
Among the well-fed beeves that graze at will.
Because our race has no great memories,
I will so live, it shall remember me
For deeds of such divine beneficence
As rivers have, that teach men what is good
By blessing them. I have been schooled—have caught
Lore from the Hebrew, deftness from the Moor—
Know the rich heritage, the milder life,
(Of nations fathered by a mighty Past ;
But were our race accurst (as they who make
Good luck a god count all unlucky men)
I would espouse their curse sooner than take
My gifts from brethren naked of all good,
And lend them to the rich for usury.

This would not be a true, at least not an exhaustive, account of the *intention* of these works, but it was an impression she was satisfied for them to make ; and, as *Daniel Deronda* was to prove later, there was something especially attractive to her in the idea of nationality as a sort of intermediate condition, giving definiteness to duty and aspiration. Historically, however, the motive of the poem is to be found in the contrast—suggested by an *Annunciation* at Venice—between a young girl's dreams and hopes and the burden laid on her of a nation's lot :—

O mother life,
That seemed to cherish me so tenderly,
Even in the womb you vowed me to the fire,
Laid on my soul the burden of men's hopes
And pledged me to redeem.

The direction given by such outer voice need not be any easier to discern than the true course of private duty, but the good of the many is sought and served by the same means as the happiness of the one, and single-minded devotion cannot greatly err :—

For still the light is measured by the eye,
And the weak organ fails. I may see ill ;
But over all belief is faithfulness,
Which fulfils vision with obedience.
So, I must grasp my morsels.

There are some who think that none of George Eliot's later writings are fully equal to the first two or three—an opinion common

enough to make it worth noting for the present generation (the next will be impartial) that a similar preference is felt by many other readers for that one of her works which they happen to have read first: even *Felix Holt* has been assigned the first place on this account. Such an effect is natural enough in the case of a writer always so unlike others and so equal to herself; but it should be allowed for, to escape the injustice of making an esteemed author his own most dangerous rival.

When the time for fair comparison arrives, it will not be surprising if *Middlemarch* is ranked among the greatest of her great works. But it is not our business now to estimate the artist, and something of special interest attaches to the character of Dorothea, partly because of the strange far-off likeness she bears to her creator, and partly because the 'Prelude' and 'Finale' permit and indeed invite us to look in her history for a revelation of George Eliot's feeling towards the aspirations of any miniature S. Teresas who may be among us now. Nay, more, it has been and is asked, What was her attitude towards, her opinion about the forms taken now by the aspirations and ambitions of her own sex? and this is the fittest place for making some response to the natural curiosity.

Was it a falling away for Dorothea to marry Will Ladislaw instead of devising more 'plans,' and continuing to occupy herself with model 'dwellings for the poor'? Is the constant exaltation of the domestic relations in George Eliot's writings to be taken as implying any disparagement of what perhaps, for the sake of distinction, we may be allowed to call professional philanthropy, or any acceptance of the views generally characterised by references to 'woman's sphere'? Was it possible for George Eliot, of all people in the world, to take a despairing view of the moral and intellectual capabilities of women, or to be out of sympathy with any phase of social aspiration or reform? In the tranquil seclusion of married life and literary industry there is little call or opportunity for the public expression of feeling or opinion on such points as these; and though those who know her writings best will have little difficulty in answering the questions for themselves, perhaps an explicit reply may be of use to others.

Undoubtedly, in the case of either men or women, George Eliot's sympathies went out more readily towards enthusiasm for the discharge of duties than for the assertion of rights. It belonged to the positive bias of her character to identify herself more with what people wished to do themselves than with what they thought somebody else ought to do for them. Her indignation was vehement enough against dishonest or malicious oppression, but the instinct to make allowance for the other side made her a bad hater in politics, and there may easily have been some personal sympathy in her descriptions of Deronda's difficulty about the choice of a career. She was

not an inviting auditor for those somewhat pachydermatous philanthropists who dwell complacently upon 'cases' and statistics which represent appalling depths of individual suffering. Her imagination realised these facts with a vividness that was physically unbearable, and unless she could give substantial help, she avoided the fruitless agitation. At the same time her interest in all rational good works was of the warmest, and she was inclined to exaggerate rather than undervalue the merits of their promoters, with one qualification only. 'Help the millions by all means,' she has written; 'I only want people not to scorn the narrower effect.' Charity that did not begin at home repelled her as much as she was attracted by the unpretentious kindness which overlooked no near opportunity; and perhaps we should not be far wrong in guessing that she thought for most people the scrupulous discharge of all present and unavoidable duties was nearly occupation enough. Not every one was called to the high but difficult vocation of setting the world to rights. But on the other hand it must be remembered that her standard of exactingness was high, and some of the things that in her eyes it was merely culpable to leave undone might be counted by others among virtues of supererogation. Indeed, it is within the limits of possibility that a philanthropist wrapped in over-much conscious virtue might imagine her cold to the objects proposed, when she only failed to see uncommon merit in their pursuit. No one, however, could recognise with more generous fervour, more delighted admiration, any genuine unobtrusive devotion in either friends or strangers, whether it were spent in making life easier to individuals, or in mending the conditions among which the masses live and labour. In weighing the comparative charm of the two vocations, she held the balance even, estimating the pro's and con's, and making allowance for the opposing dangers of narrowness and diffusion, the enlarged egotism of the family and the lukewarm sensibility that comes from dealing only with abstract masses.

All that has been said on this point in general applies equally, with perhaps a touch of more acute personal feeling, to her views with regard to women. She gave unqualified and unhesitating assent to what might be called the most 'advanced' opinions on this subject; only the opinions had to be advocated in practice with large tolerance and disinterestedness, and she wished to be assured that nothing of what is valuable in the social order of the past should be sacrificed in the quest of even certain future good. In matters intellectual she had, what is perhaps equally rare in men and women, the same standard for both sexes. In an article in which we trace her hand on 'Silly Novels by Lady Novelists' (*West. Rev.* October 1856) we read: 'It must be plain to every one who looks impartially and extensively into feminine literature, that its greatest deficiencies are due hardly more to the want of intellectual power than to the want of those

moral qualities that contribute to literary excellence, patient diligence, a sense of the responsibility involved in publication, and an appreciation of the sacredness of the writer's art.' Upon the two latter points she felt with peculiar strength, though reluctant, as herself a successful writer, to express all she thought. No amount of demand for the 'trash that smothers excellence' seemed to her a justification for the manufacture of slipshod compilation or trivial torrents of small talk in print. As a step towards the recognition of a higher standard, at least by women, she naturally looked towards an improved education, and it will be remembered that among the first gifts towards the foundation of the college which is now Girton was 100*l.* from 'the author of *Adam Bede*,' with whom at that date such sums were not superfluously plentiful. With her delight in the mere acquisition of knowledge of all kinds for its own sake, there was necessarily something almost comic in questions as to the capacity of feminine brains; but it must be admitted that she is the first woman who has carried so complete a panoply of learning without being oppressed, not to say smothered, under its weight.

An incident in the composition of *Daniel Deronda* well illustrates the conscientious care with which every detail in her works was elaborated. It will be remembered that Deronda was to sacrifice academical honours to his friendship for Hans, and her first thought was that the latter had been rusticated for some piece of mischief—an Hogarthian caricature of the college authorities—but on satisfying herself that in these days men were usually 'sent down' for uninteresting breaches of discipline calling for little sympathy, she at once sacrificed the incident—which in itself could not but have been admirably done (she had paid a visit to the 'Hogarth's' at the National Gallery on purpose), on the ground that 'when one has to invoke the reader's sympathy, anything equivocal in the probabilities is a deadly defect'—and substituted the unnoticeable explanation that Hans caught cold in his eyes by travelling third class for economy after some bit of extravagance.

Of the minor poems, besides the well-known sonnets, the 'Minor Prophet' is the only one which gives a glimpse at one real moment in the writer's life. It is dated 1865, and it is pleasant to imagine that the

Patched and plodding citizen,
Waiting upon the pavement with the throng,
While some victorious world-hero makes
Triumphal entry,

had a real existence—was one of the crowd lining the roads to Sydenham when London was delighting to honour Garibaldi, and that George Eliot's eyes fell on him when the hero had passed, and he began

To think with pleasure there is just one bun
Left in his pocket that may serve to tempt
The wide-eyed lad, whose weight is all too much
For that young mother's arms.

It is painful to think that we narrowly escaped—by Mr. Lewes's insistence—having this poem permanently withheld from publication. We welcome it especially for the explanation it affords of the element of affection in so much of George Eliot's tolerance. A flavour of onion impregnates all Colin's visionary joys:—

Speaking in parable, I am Colin Clout.
A clinging flavour penetrates my life,
My onion is imperfectness :

Nay, I am apt, when floundering confused
From too rash flight, to grasp at paradox
And pity future men who will not know
A keen experience with pity blent ;

A foolish, nay, a wicked, paradox !
For purest pity is the eye of love
Melting at sight of sorrow ; and to grieve
Because it sees no sorrow, shows a love
Warped from its truer nature, turned to love
Of merest habit, like the miser's greed.
But I am Colin still : my prejudice
Is for the flavour of my daily food.

When one comes to think of it, a prejudice *against* this flavour is the surest sign of a dyspeptic constitution.

The only poem which has not been republished was written in the spring of '74, at a time when the author's health and spirits were unequal to other work, and as usual she hesitated long before consenting to its appearance, mainly on the ground that people would look to it for a complete profession of faith, while there was as much left out as said. When it was published, after four years, the original title 'A Symposium' had to be altered because of the recent writings bearing that name in this Review. Even if they had not had the sad distinction of being the last, the two chapters of more or less personal confession or reminiscence which introduce the *Impressions of Theophrastus Such* would have had a special interest. A charming magnanimity mingles with the subtlety of the ruthless self-examination:—

I really do not want to learn from my enemies : I prefer having none to learn from. Instead of being glad when men use me despitely, I wish they would behave better and find a more amiable occupation for their intervals of business. In brief, after a close intimacy with myself for a longer period than I choose to mention, I find within me a permanent longing for approbation, sympathy, and love.

But finding experimentally that the demand for sympathy is in excess of the supply—

while my desire to explain myself in private ears has been quelled, the habit of getting interested in the experience of others has been continually gathering strength, and I am really at the point of finding that this world would be worth living in without any lot of one's own. Is it not possible for me to enjoy the scenery of the earth without saying to myself, I have a cabbage garden in it? But this sounds like the lunacy of fancying oneself everybody else and being unable to play one's own part decently; another form of the disloyal attempt to be independent of the common lot and live without a sharing of pain.

One passage in the *Looking Backward* reminds us of the pride Adam Bede felt in answering strangers, 'I'm Thias Bede's lad:'. 'It seemed to me that advanced age was appropriate to a father, as indeed in all things I considered him a parent so much to my honour that the mention of my relationship to him was likely to secure me regard among those to whom I was otherwise a stranger.' At the present day it is likely that visitors to Loamshire might find their inquiries answered by thriving countrymen, 'Old Mr. Evans of Griff? I knew Mr. Evans,' as if such knowledge were itself a guarantee of respectability in the county.

In lingering over these memories one can only feel the powerlessness of words to characterise the sweetness and the power of all she was. Nothing has been said of her fellowship with that side of the artist nature, its large demands and passionate vehemence, of which Fedalma's dance and Armgart's song are images; nothing of such traits as her delight in all fragrance, 'from that of syringas or sandalwood to that most spiritual of incense which comes from the tone in which one is spoken to;'; nothing of the scrupulous tenderness which made her—if for a moment in conversational eagerness she had let some caressing word or gesture pass without response—come back upon it as an omission to be repaired; nothing of her delight in beauty, almost Hellenic in its reverence for a good gift of the gods which should be matched with worthy living; nothing of that refinement of sensibility which made her shrink from direct praise and note, as one of the paradoxes of emotion, that she was less touched by any tribute to herself than by reading of a great tribute to some one else whom she admired—by the account of a similar incident that occurred to Dickens in the streets at York than by the address of an unknown lady, 'Will you let me kiss your hand?' as she was leaving the concert room at St. James's Hall on Saturday afternoon.

It is to be feared that posterity will never know exactly what was the living aspect of George Eliot's face; only a very great painter could have seized at once the outline and something of the varying expression, and her reluctance to have her portrait taken, her private person made to a certain extent public property in that way, has deprived us of any such memorial. Future generations will have to draw on their imagination to conceive a face cast in the massive mould of Savonarola, but spare and spiritualised into a closer brotherhood with the other Florentine of the *Divina Commedia*. The

features might be too large and rugged for womanly beauty, but when the pale face was tinged with a faint flush of tenderness or animation, when the wonderful eyes were lighted up with eager passion, and the mouth melted into curves of unutterable sweetness, the soul itself seemed to shine through its worn framework with a radiance of almost unearthly power, so that a stranger, seeing her for the first time, asked why he had never been told she was so beautiful.

No doubt there was something in the sense of security, the consciousness that the utmost wisdom and knowledge were within reach in the background, but the special charm of her intimacy sprang rather from the purely personal influence, the feeling of being face to face with a most beautiful soul, and on the whole there was more thought of love than of instruction in those who sat at her feet. Thus, even if all could be said well and worthily that here is but feebly hinted, it would still be necessary to appeal to the trust men have a right to ask from each other for belief in what only a few can fully know. We can only look to this trust and the loyalty of a long line of spiritual descendants to hand on the tradition, that precious as the writings of George Eliot are and must be always, her life and character were yet more beautiful than they.

EDITH SIMCOX.

PROFIT-SHARING.

SOME forty years ago Channing delivered to a Boston audience a course of lectures 'On the Elevation of the Working Classes.' These lectures possess many conspicuous excellences of thought, feeling, and expression, but pre-eminent even among these are the piercing clearness of vision with which the remote goal for a workman's best efforts is descried, and the energetic precision with which it is pointed out.

There is (writes Channing) but one elevation for a labourer and for all other men. There are not different kinds of dignity for different orders of men, but one and the same for all. The only elevation of a human being consists in the exercise, growth, energy of the higher principles and powers of his soul. A bird may be shot upwards to the skies by a foreign power; but it rises, in the true sense of the word, only when it spreads its own wings and soars by its own living power. So a man may be thrust upward into a conspicuous place by outward accidents; but he rises only in so far as he exerts himself and expands his best faculties and ascends by a free effort to a nobler region of thought and action. Such is the elevation I desire for the labourer, and I desire no other. This elevation is, indeed, to be aided by an improvement in his outward condition, and in turn it greatly improves his outward lot; and, thus connected, outward good is real and great; but supposing it to exist in separation from inward growth and life, it would be nothing worth, nor would I raise a finger to promote it.

While, however, Channing saw thus clearly wherein consisted the only real elevation of the working classes, and also recognised the powerful influence exerted by their outward condition on their inner life, he was unable to perceive, save vaguely and dimly, the agencies by which a genuine rise in the labourer's condition was to be brought about. He hoped much from increased temperance, economy, hygienic knowledge, education, reading and clearer development of Christian principle, but how these vital influences were to be organised as direct consequences of changed industrial relations was a problem the very statement of which would probably have appeared to him visionary and futile.

By a remarkable coincidence, at the very time when Channing was defining in America the spiritual aim to be set before the working classes, Leclaire in Paris was preparing an industrial revolution, which, though based at first on purely economic considerations, was destined in his master hand to bring in its train precisely that moral renova-

tion to which Channing looked forward. I refer of course to the principle of participation by workmen in the profits of enterprise.

In the *Nineteenth Century* for September 1880, I gave a somewhat detailed account of the remarkable chain of associated institutions grouped by Leclaire around this central principle.

They constitute a permanent industrial Foundation, unique both in the nature of its organisation and in the extent of the benefits, material and moral, which it bestows on its members. This uniqueness, however, while it attracts public attention in an eminent degree to the Maison Leclaire, is calculated to discourage with equal force all imitation of an establishment so elaborately and munificently organised, founded too by an exceptionally situated man of unquestionable genius. The very completeness of the organisation thus tends to obscure the merits of the principle on which it is based. I hope, therefore, to do service by showing that participation in profits, organised on a much less extensive scale and on simpler plans in a large number of industrial and commercial establishments on the Continent, is producing results of the same kind, though not so far-reaching, as those attained by the Maison Leclaire.

In the present article, after indicating the principal sources of information in regard to these establishments, I shall describe selected instances of the main types on which participation has been organised in them. The results obtained shall be characterised, as far as practicable, in the words of those who have experienced them. A cursory survey of the ground already covered by participatory operations abroad will then lead to a few closing remarks on the applicability of similar methods in this country.

Of published works on participation by far the most important is that of Dr. Victor Böhmert,¹ director of the Royal Statistical Bureau, and Professor of Political Economy at the *Polytechnicum* at Dresden. It rests on an international investigation of the most extensive kind, carried out with extraordinary industry and perseverance. In describing the systems adopted by individual houses, extracts from regulations, statements of account, indeed all kinds of first-hand information, are abundantly supplied, and the results flowing from the methods adopted are often stated in direct communications made by the masters, and, in a few important cases, also by the men employed.

For the results in Paris alone, the chief authority is a volume by M. Fougereousse,² which includes a number of cases not described by Böhmert.

A further source of trustworthy information is the periodical *Bulletin*,³ published by a French society formed in 1879 in order 'to

¹ *Die Gewinnbetheiligung*. Leipzig, Brockhaus, 1878.

² *Patrons et Ouvriers de Paris*. Paris, Chaix, 1880.

³ *Bulletin de la Société de la Participation aux Bénéfices*. Paris, Chaix.

ascertain and make known the different modes of participation actually employed in industry.'

It will be readily understood that, besides these general works, there exists a great mass of separate publications dealing with the organisation of individual houses. These are far too numerous for specification save in a *catalogue raisonné* of such literature.

In selecting the types of participation to be described in this article, I have followed the mode of classification introduced by M. Fougères, based on the manner in which the workpeople's share in profits is made over to them.

The simplest system is that which distributes this share in ready money at the close of each year's account without making any conditions as to the disposal of the sums so paid over. This mode of proceeding is adopted by but a very limited group of firms, the most important among which is the pianoforte-making establishment of M. Bord,⁴ rue des Poissonniers, Paris. Participation was introduced in 1865, in consequence of a strike, on the following basis. After deduction from the net profits of interest at 10 per cent. on M. Bord's capital embarked in the business, the remainder is divided into two parts, one proportional to the amount of interest on capital drawn by M. Bord, the other to the whole sum paid during the year in wages to the workmen. The former of these two parts goes to M. Bord, the latter is divided among all his employés who can show six months' continuous presence in the house up to the day of the annual distribution. The share obtained by each workman is proportional to the sum which he has earned in wages, paid at the full market rate during the year on which the division of profits is made. The number of M. Bord's employés was, at the beginning of 1878, a little over 400, and the sums he has paid in labour-dividends during the last three years are, as he has been kind enough to inform me, 3,784*l.*, 2,874*l.* and 3,548*l.*, which represent 15 per cent., 12 per cent., and 16 per cent. respectively on the men's earnings in wages during those years. The total amount thus paid, exclusively out of profits, since the introduction of this system in 1865 is 39,300*l.*

M. Bord has satisfied himself that a good and thrifty employment is made of these annual labour-dividends, and he considers that the effect of the system in attaching the workmen to the house, and its influence on their relations towards their employer, are excellent.

From the system of immediate possession, I pass to the diametrically opposite procedure introduced thirty years ago, under the auspices of M. Alfred de Courcy, into one of the most important insurance companies of Paris, the *Compagnie d'Assurances Générales*.⁵ Five per cent. on the yearly profits realised by the company is allotted to its staff, which numbers about 250 employés of all grades, whose fixed

⁴ Böhmert, § 35. Fougères, p. 67.

⁵ Böhmert, § 76. Fougères, p. 71.

salaries are at least equal to those paid in non-participating insurance offices at Paris. No part of this share in profits is handed over in annual dividends. Each successive payment is capitalised and accumulates at 4 per cent. compound interest until the beneficiary has completed twenty-five years of work in the house, or sixty-five years of age. At the expiration of this period, he is at liberty either to sink the value of his account in the purchase of a life annuity in the office, or to invest it in French government or railway securities. Should he decide on the investment as against the life insurance, he is allowed to draw only the annual dividends arising from it, as the company retain the stock certificates, and not till after his death abandon their hold on the principal in favour of such persons as he may designate by will to receive it. M. de Courcy, managing director of this company, is well known as the ardent and eloquent advocate of this system of long-deferred, or even only testamentarily transmitted, possession. He insists on the large sums which it has accumulated in comparatively short spaces of time, mentioning the instances of a simple bookkeeper, in whose name 480*l.* stood to the good after fourteen years of work, a sub-cashier with 800*l.* at the end of twenty-five years, and a superior official with 2,600*l.* after a similar period. From the company's point of view he alleges the increased permanence, steadiness, and assiduity which the deposit account has produced in its staff of employes, and instances, in particular, the redoubled efforts which they willingly make at the seasons of heavy pressure of business. From a letter addressed to me by M. de Courcy in November last I translate a few sentences which contain his most recent views on this subject:—

My present opinion is more favourable than ever both to the principle of participation and in particular to my system of deferred possession. The institution has now had thirty years of experience, that is to say of unvarying successes. Each year, by augmenting the account of the employé, makes him feel more strongly the advantage of the *deferred* participation. Each year, too, the company appreciates better what it gains in fidelity in return for these sacrifices. My general principle is that there are no thoroughly satisfactory business transactions except those which are satisfactory to both the parties concerned. Experience has justified our institution from each of these points of view. It is excellent for the employes and excellent for the company.

The great majority of participating houses combine the two systems just described; they distribute a part of the workpeople's share of profits in cash-bonuses, and invest the remainder for purposes of saving. Among establishments thus organised, I select for description the firm *Billon et Isaac*,⁶ a joint-stock company manufacturing parts of the mechanism of musical boxes, at St. Jean near Geneva. The results in that house have been described and com-

⁶ Böhmert, § 6.

mented upon with great fulness of detail by M. Billon in a separate volume, and by members of the working staff in statements communicated to Professor Böhmert and published in his treatise. The system adopted rests on the following exceptionally liberal basis. After deduction of interest on capital and payments to the reserve and maintenance funds, the entire net profits are divided into two equal parts. One of these parts goes to the shareholders and the administration; the other part constitutes the portion assigned to labour. Of this latter sum one half is annually distributed in cash bonuses proportional to wages earned individually during the year, and the remaining half is invested in the gradual purchase, for the respective beneficiaries, of 4*l.* shares in the company, which carry with them votes at its general meetings. The material results of participation in this house since its first introduction in 1871 appear from the following table, in which the sums stated in francs are given true to the nearest pound :—

Year	No. of Participants	Total average share allotted to a workman	Proportion of this share to his entire annual wages
		£	Per cent.
1871-72	103	8	18½
1872-73	109	14	28½
1873-74	92	11	20½
1874-75	102	12	23½
1875-76	140	9	17½
1876-77	98	2	4
1877-78	82	0 ⁷	0 ⁷
1878-79	89	4	8
1879-80	89	6	10

It will be seen from the above figures that participation has, in this house, had to pass through the ordeal of severe industrial depression directly following on a period of abounding prosperity. This fact should be borne in mind in reading the opinions now to be cited, which were written when the effects of bad trade had already made themselves felt.

The exceptionally complete insight into the working of participation afforded us in the firm *Billon et Isaac* will, I trust, be held to justify somewhat full quotation from the important judgments on that system expressed by members of the house.

I begin with an extract from a letter written by a workman to Professor Böhmert in 1877 :—

Since the introduction of participation in profits into this house important changes have become visible. There is no denying the fact that the workman who receives only fixed wages and knows beforehand that however much pains he may take with his work he will not on that account receive an additional farthing from his employers—that this workman becomes more and more negligent and does not bring to bear, as he might do, his full physical and intellectual capacities.

To my great regret I am bound to confess that this kind of thing occurred only too often among ourselves. Such negligence, moreover, does not show itself in the workshop only, it also invades family life. The workman, once sunk to this point, will in the end care as little for the good of his own family as for that of the establishment which employs him. . . . If he has a numerous family to support, it often happens that, in order to avoid seeing his own poverty, or to escape from the complaints of his wife, he seeks a refuge in the pot-house. The inevitable consequence of this conduct is the steadily increasing degradation of this workman and of his family; similar instances present themselves in abundance at Geneva.

Nevertheless, to remedy such evils is not so difficult a task as one might suppose. For proof of this it suffices to institute a comparison between the circumstances of the workman in our house before participation in profits with those which we now find there after the introduction of that system.

The undersigned has been working for the last eight years in this factory; he has therefore had sufficient opportunities for observation in this respect, and he can testify that participation in profits has done real wonders in it; one might even say that it has entirely altered the mode of life and habits of the workmen. Formerly, no one thought save of himself and of his individual interests; quarrels about work were nothing out of the common way. Now, on the contrary, all consider themselves as members of one and the same family, and the good of the establishment has become the object of every one's solicitude, because our own personal interest is bound up in it.

It is with pleasure that one remarks how each man strives to fill up his time with conscientious effort to effect the utmost possible saving on the materials, to collect carefully the fallen chips of metal; and how, if one or other now and then is guilty of some negligence, a joking remark from his neighbour suffices to bring him to order again.

If now we cast a glance at the workman's family, we cannot help seeing that there too a notable change for the better has been produced. . . . Those men who formerly spent the chief part of their spare time at the public house, where they gave vent to such sentiments as the following: 'None of us can ever come to anything,' have now got hold of quite different ideas. The first payment of shares in profits has laid in their minds the foundation-stone of a new way of looking at things, and awakened hopes for the realisation of which saving is an indispensable condition. One cherishes the hope of purchasing a cottage; another wishes to set up a little shop; a third thinks of accumulating a small sum towards his old age, and, perceiving that the thing may prove possible, takes to staying at home: his wife, overjoyed at this change, strives to make his fireside as pleasant to him as possible, and supports him in the enterprise which he has taken in hand.

The benefits of the system introduced among us are still more manifest in times of commercial crisis like that through which we have passed this winter. For a considerable time we have been reduced to seven hours of labour, and the earnings of a workman with a family on his hands barely sufficed to find food and clothing. Nevertheless one's house-rent had to be paid, and, inasmuch as here nearly all lodgings are paid for three months in advance, more than one of us would have had to sleep with the stars for roof, had not the deposit-account come opportunely to the rescue.

I take the following extracts from a joint opinion signed by seventy of *Billon et Isaac's* employés in the same year:—

Every workman who has become a shareholder and joint proprietor with his employers devotes his utmost attention to the success of the undertaking. The workman, having the same interests as his employers, and perceiving that he is no longer treated like a machine, works with energy and courage: our hearts are

warmed and cheered by contact with those of our employers, who are always ready to set us a good example.

Piece-work, premiums, the raising of wages . . . can in nowise replace, for the workman's heart and the master's advantage, participation in profits: under this principle one works with good heart, which is the same thing as saying that one works more and better. It is no longer a mercenary work.

Next hear the opinion of M. Billon in 1877:—

We soon became aware of the good influence which the prospect of sharing in profits exercised on our workmen. An entirely fresh zeal for work, and a lively interest in the house, showed themselves among them: a genuine solidarity was not slow in establishing itself, each man comprehending that all negligence in the performance of his duty was prejudicial alike to his colleagues and to himself. The task of superintendence became easy to us, and we were able thenceforward, without fear of offending any one, to insist on points of detail to which we had hitherto been obliged to shut our eyes. Moreover, the feeling of security with which the attitude of our workmen inspired us, permitted us to give ourselves up wholly to the development of our business. . . . It has often been said to us, 'You have not had difficulties with your workmen, thanks to good years. But let an industrial crisis arise, and great will be your embarrassment when you are obliged to dismiss your employés.' This contingency, which assuredly we had foreseen when organising participation, has presented itself; and we can say henceforward that it has done nothing but confirm our faith in the principle. . . . The crisis has served to demonstrate that, in bad as in good years, we are better situated in reference to the men than are those who have not applied the principle of participation. As to our workpeople, it has made them understand, better than any arguments could have done, the benefits of obligatory thrift. Those among them who have shared in profits during these five years have received an annual average of 20 per cent. on their wages, so that, if they have laid by the entire fruit of the participation, they possessed at the time of the last division a sum equivalent to one year's wages.⁸

In reply to a letter of inquiry, M. Billon was good enough to send me his most recent views, on November 15, 1880, in the following terms:—

You ask me my present opinion on the working of participation in our house. I am happy to tell you that this principle continues to work to our entire satisfaction. . . . After ten years of experience we congratulate ourselves more and more on having adopted it. Its application has to such a degree become ingrained into our modes of doing business that we should not know how to get on without it; the management of an undertaking appears to us no longer possible without this element of justice, harmony, and peace.

After referring to piece-work, premiums, &c., as all good in their places and measures, M. Billon adds:—

These methods are all inadequate to obtain the complete adhesion of the workman (*Fouquier tout entier*); it is only by participation in profits accorded on a suitable scale that his interest in the economic side of an undertaking (care of materials, products, &c. &c.) is thoroughly aroused, and that the sentiment of solidarity is developed and bears its fruits.

⁸ *Participation des ouvriers aux bénéfices des patrons*, par Jean Billon. Genève, H. Georg, 1877, pp. 28, 30–31.

Before quitting, as limits of space compel me to do at this point, the methods practised in individual houses, I will roughly indicate the amount of progress which the system has as yet made, and the varieties of industry to which it has been successfully applied. Putting together the most recent data, I shall be below the mark in saying that *one hundred* continental firms are now working on a participatory basis. The principle has been introduced with good results into agriculture; into the administration of railways, banks, and insurance offices; into iron-smelting, type-founding, and cotton-spinning; into the manufacture of tools, paper, chemicals, lucifer-matches, soap, cardboard, and cigarette-papers; into printing, engraving, cabinet-making, house-painting, and plumbing; into stockbroking, book-selling, the wine trade, and haberdashery.

This list does not profess to be anything like complete, but it will probably suffice for the purpose now in view. The establishments which it summarises differ in size and importance as much as in the character of the industry which they pursue, from the paper-mills of M. Laroche-Joubert at Angoulême with its 1,500 workmen, to the establishment of M. Lenoir at Paris, with its forty house-painters. I may add that the movement is making decided headway, a considerable number of houses having given in their adhesions during the last two years.

The benefits accruing from participation successfully practised may be thus summed up. It furnishes to the workman a supplementary income under circumstances which directly encourage, or even by a gentle compulsion actually enforce, saving; and, by associating him in a very real sense with his employer, it arouses aspirations from which great moral improvement may be confidently anticipated. The employer, besides sharing in whatever surplus profits are realised by the more efficient labour which participation calls forth, obtains the boon of industrial stability and the support of a united corporate feeling elsewhere unknown. Independently of these advantages to the two parties directly concerned, the customer of a participating house finds in its very organisation a guarantee for enhanced excellence of workmanship and rapidity of execution.

On the facts set out in the preceding pages it seems natural to ask whether there is any reason why a system which is producing abroad results of so much value should not prove equally beneficial if properly introduced among ourselves. It is no sufficient answer to point to half a dozen English experiments in which the system after a few years of trial was eventually abandoned, and say that the principle 'has been tried and has failed.' In order to infer from the abandonment of a system the unsoundness of its central principle, evidence must be forthcoming to show that the evils which led to the failure were necessary consequences of the principle. This has certainly never been proved with respect to the unsuccessful

English experiments; and my confident belief is that, in the most conspicuous cases of failure both here and on the Continent, the causes which led to the break-down can be distinctly shown to have been extraneous to the principle of participation.

A more satisfactory mode of investigating the adaptability of the system to English circumstances lies in ascertaining, first, what are the conditions under which it promises an economic success, and next, whether those conditions hold to any important extent in this country.

The fund on which participation draws is the surplus profit realised in consequence of the enhanced efficiency of the work done under its stimulating influence. Such extra profit is, therefore, obtainable wherever workmen have it in their power to increase the quantity, improve the quality, or diminish the cost price of their staple of production by more effective exertion, by increased economy in the use of tools and materials, or by a reduction in the costs of superintendence. In other words, the surplus profit realisable will depend on the influence which manual labour is capable of exerting upon production. Evidently, therefore, this influence will be greatest in branches of industry where the skill of the labourer plays the leading part, where the outlay on tools and materials bears a small ratio to the cost of production, and where individual superintendence is difficult and expensive. It will, on the contrary, be least effective in industries where mechanism is the principal agency, where the interest on capital fixed in machinery is the chief element of cost price, and where the workmen, assembled in large factories, can be easily and effectively superintended.

Participation would, therefore, be applied with the best prospects of success to such industries as agriculture, mining, building, carpentering, decorating, &c., where wages form a leading element of cost; while the least promising field would be supplied by cotton-spinning, weaving, and other machine-dominated branches of production. That agriculture offers a peculiarly valuable opening will not be doubted by those who are acquainted with the extraordinary results attained during Mr. John Scott Vandeleur's Irish experiment at Ralahine in the years 1831-3, where an intelligently planned system of profit-sharing secured a complete local triumph over an acute crisis of agrarian discontent and outrage.⁹

In coal-mining I am assured on excellent authority that a great amount of preventible waste is occasioned by timber, plates, &c., being carelessly buried under *débris* and thus finally lost. That

⁹ See Pare's *Co-operative Agriculture*, Longmans, 1870, and a series of papers commenced in the *Co-operative News* of April 16, 1881, by Mr. E. T. Craig, who was the Secretary, and to a great extent the practical organiser, of the 'Ralahine Association.' The attention of persons interested in the future of Irish agricultural labourers cannot, at the present conjuncture, be too urgently invited to the details of this startlingly successful and suggestive experiment.

much time is frittered away, and much material and gear wastefully dealt with, by workmen employed in the house-industries to which I have referred, will not be disputed. It is clear, then, that English workmen have it largely in their power to enhance profits by contributing better and more economical labour. That they will be ready to make the more assiduous efforts involved in such labour, as soon as they have thoroughly grasped the motives for increased zeal which participation holds out, appears to me equally certain. If, however, the experiment is to be tried, it is obviously from the employers that the initiative must come. They will, of course, make no trial of the system without a preliminary study of the methods adopted on the Continent, with regard to which so much trustworthy information has now been accumulated by French and German research. In view, however, of the great results which participation seems to promise in raising masses of the labouring population out of the *prolétaire* or hand-to-mouth class, and thereby drying up a main source of our national pauperism, it is to be hoped that employers of labour, productive or distributive, whether on a large or on a small scale, will consider that a complete examination of the whole subject treated in this article, undertaken with a direct view to practical action, is urgently called for.

SEDLEY TAYLOR.

POSTSCRIPT.

A special Society is now (April) being formed to disseminate in this country translations from the best foreign sources, and other trustworthy information, on Participation in Profits. Persons inclined to join this Society are invited to write to me at *Trinity College, Cambridge*.

S. T.

FRENCH VERSE IN ENGLISH.

TRANSLATION from so flexible and tender a language as French into our more 'brutal' English—prose or verse—will always have somewhat the effect of a thing looked at through a magnifying glass. Nor is this an effect to be quite deprecated, inasmuch as it should be better to see too clearly anything that is worth seeing than not to see it at all, provided that one see it in some sort of proportion. Which forms, in the main, my excuse for the verses which I purpose setting forth in this paper; and if they run a chance of offending a critical eye and jarring on a sensitive ear by their directness and the rather cumbersome rules with which I trammel them, I shall try at least to save them from baldness and coarseness, extremes into which practice shows one that such work, so trammelled, is most likely to run. I would add that these renderings are to be regarded as experimental, and were, many of them, written for music.

We have become familiarised of late, to an unprecedented degree, with French originals of all kinds in English dress, and we are always being reminded by the stage and by our lighter reading how little that which charms us most is native here. In the work, for instance, of our young poets, we hear something louder than an echo from French singing of a bygone age, and perhaps the best turn this can serve is the sending us to the originals to find out with how much more grace these very things were first said or sung. Mere translation of such originals need not be an unthankful task. Hard indeed it is to pour the wine 'from the gold into the silver cup without spilling a drop,' as has once and again been done, but there is a sincere pleasure in handling them so far as to register, however inadequately, each turn of their expression and their thought to enrich another language. I speak only of translation into verse, recognising indeed no other mode of rendering poetry which allows of showing how intimately 'the small and the great' are there commingled, how much the worth of the whole depends on the arrangement of the parts; and I cannot help thinking that the closer and harder one makes one's rules, the nearer will the likeness of one's translations be to the originals, such at least as are rather 'fine' than 'broad,' and from these my examples will be mostly taken.

To be brief, then, while in no haste to disparage other ways of work, should this be proved untenable, I want *rhythmical* and not

seldom syllabic equality, and a *variation of rhyme* to correspond to the intermixture of the 'rimes masculines et féminines,' which I see no means of gaining in English but through rhymes in single and double syllables.

Anticipating, although not accepting, the objection that French poetry is not rhythmical, while English verse must be, to suit our taste at all, I propose (in doubtful cases) the *test of usual reading* for decision of accent in the graver measures, and the *test of music* in the lyrical.¹

There is nothing more painful by way of preface than destructive criticism, and the task were endless did one dare to face it, and always open to the retort of failure; there is risk, moreover, of losing heart and temper over the positive and negative faults of most translators, their selfishness and their want of care. It will be better to begin my examples as early in French literature as I possibly can, and, where I touch upon some poem which has suffered from such treatment, to try and make it illustrate what I say. After all, it is in one's examples that the merits of one's own fashion of translating must be shown; it is by them that it must stand or fall. But there are sundry little books before me highly praised by many courteous readers, which I too would gladly praise for a certain delicacy of touch, were not their demerits of too glaring and detrimental a nature to be lightly passed over. Their tone is misleading and their measures inaccurate, and faults which in less graceful and scholarly volumes would be swamped by coarser faults are here forced into their due prominence. It is bad to give no distinctiveness to the poets of the sixteenth century, to deaden their colour into a uniform grey of regret and spoil their singing; but it is worse for any French student to do this to de Musset and rob him of his satire and his wit as well as his 'intention' and his metrical charm, inasmuch as de Musset, of whom I shall want to give several specimens after my manner, is more definitely French than any other poet of his land. He is modern, direct, Parisian.

What I have to say upon *technique*, too, will find its place with such of my examples as may call severally for technical explanation, tiresome in the gross unless to some half-dozen readers: but I premise generally that, in the matter of rhymes, I shall count such words as 'flower' dissyllabic at the end of a line, unless where I may spell them as monosyllables and rhyme them with 'our.' They are in sufficiently marked contrast to the masculine monosyllable (although our rhythmic English will not allow them dissyllabic value), and our double rhymes are too few for us to spare them. He would be over-daring, however—I do not say he would be wrong—who should use 'our'

¹ With the musician it rests first to decide the accent in lyrics; but there is also a further responsibility that rests with him, on which there is much to be said, which my subject gives me inclination but not leave to say; *disregard of rhyme, of rhythm, and of elision* being the fault of nearly all musical settings of French words, saving those by French composers, and sometimes of those too.

and the like spellings of the same sound as dissyllabic, and I shall not venture to do this, though Mr. Rossetti's *Song of the Bower* proves that no less an artist than he can do so. But then he has not bound himself to dissyllables, and might object that he never meant the other rhymes as such, and that the halves of each stanza are of diverse form. Mr. Rossetti is one of the translators whose perfect work disheartens me, because, while raised above carping by a certain original and poetic touch, it is not amenable to what I cannot but consider as the first rules and tests of translation.

Villon's ballade *Of Dead Ladies*, for instance, contains but three rhymes, as such a ballade must in French, and should in English, but Mr. Rossetti's version contains no less than eight. His first verse is faultless, but his second does not belong to it as Villon's second does. One could wish it might; 'only that this can never be!' The companion ballade to this, *The Lords of Old Time*, has been rendered, with some words of preface too diffident in tone, by Mr. Swinburne in a manner wholly accurate and praiseworthy. This translation, if inferior in interest to the ballade *Of Dead Ladies*, is far its superior in point of conscience. Indeed Mr. Swinburne's translations from Villon, given us together only lately in his second series of *Poems and Ballads*, are just as good as they can be, and it is instructive to compare his *Ballad of the Gibbet* (in its wholesome iambic verse) with Mr. Lang's, as fainthearted and metrically inaccurate a piece of work as may be.² Henceforward must be left to Mr. Swinburne

Villon, our sad, bad, glad, mad brother's name,

as, with an echo of Mr. Browning's incisive verse, he calls him. Excellent as is Mr. Payne's translation, Mr. Swinburne's verse alone is

Beauty making beautiful old rhyme
In praise of ladies dead, and lovely knights.

Again, while Mr. Rossetti's *John of Tours* will suit the traditional music very well, his rendering of *The Three Princesses* will in nowise fit the beautiful old song from which the French words are inseparable. The colour indeed is kept, but the form is gone. It is the work of a painter, not of a musician. One is surprised to see among poet-critics Mr. Swinburne marvelling at Mr. Rossetti's consummate accuracy in translating a song into a poem that will not sing to the song's tune at all, and is not even, rhythmically speaking, its fellow, and Mr. Gosse in a most thoughtful essay praising Mr. Lang's 'careful translation' of a rondel, which he has just said consists necessarily of fourteen lines, into a little English poem of twelve! One pities the student of French poetry who is to learn from these samples of work what is this ballade, or this rondel, or this song.

² In his *Ballads and Lyrics of Old France*, to which I must make further reference by-and-by. Mr. Lang's translation of the *Arbor amoris*, by the way, is correct in its order of rhymes.

Making verse translations is, after all, very like making jars. Happiest they who, with the original shape, turn out the colour of the original to artist eyes, but, failing both, the scientific observer and the student must have the shape matched first of all. It is only now and again that the iridescence or the 'deep blue' of the pattern is matched in an unspoiled mould, but the failures may be counted by hundreds. Let us start with determining that the fashion of our poems shall follow their originals, and then pray that something of their glow be upon them which indeed cannot so be wholly absent, rather than set to work to reproduce what we arbitrarily call 'the colour,' and, failing here, be found to fail in all. But even thus, where the colour is, let us give thanks though the shape be changed, provided the contents be held as well.³

M. Léon Contanseau, in his useful little 'Précis' of French literature, gives the following as his very first specimen of verse 'in the *langue d'oïl*,' dating it 1160, and prefacing it 'nous nous sentons là dans notre pays : '—

When the violet breaks to flower,
And the rose and wild rose spring,
And the birds are carolling,
Then the little loves have power ;
Then they gaily sting.

Long since I hushed my string,
Now will I sing,
And will bring
Little songs for dower
For my love's love, to her bower,
Where erewhile my heart took wing.

The next lines he offers are from Thibaut IV., 'Thibaut of Navarre, who made love-songs for Queen Blanche, St. Louis' mother, whom he loved with passionate worship.' But reproductions of troubadour-singing are only of service where one can set them side by side with the original ; so I will pass on to his sample of Alain Chartier's work, which he dates an. 1450, towards the close of the poet's life :—

Ye ladies, and each gentle maiden,
If joy draw near to you of heaven,
Hear this hard news wherewith I am laden,
Who learned it but this new year's even ;
And know what hath my steps persuaded
That do not often seek to yours,
Till, of your grace, my dole be stayed in
Comfort and help and heartening lures.

For this befell me on that night
A-waiting for the sunrise, where
I lay, not roused nor drowsing quite,
At cockcrowing or earlier :

³ It is hardly necessary to premise that, with Mr. Swinburne, I find elision 'a necessity, not a luxury' in English verse.

Even Love, made plain before my sight
 At my bed's head with bow astrain,
 Who me bespake: 'Disloyal Knight,
 Lo here thy listing-fees again!'

It is so pretty that one hardly wonders at 'fair Scotch Margaret,' the wife of Louis XI., kissing Chartier when she saw him one day asleep, in despite of his ugliness. 'For it is not the man,' she said to those about her, 'that I kiss, but the mouth whence so many lovely things have come.'

M. Contanseau's 'presentment' of Charles d'Orléans' famous rondel is, like Mr. Lang's translation of it, not a rondel at all, only that Mr. Lang gives the poem only twelve lines and M. Contanseau sixteen! Here is a literal, not to say bald, rendering from the real rondel form given by Mr. Gosse in a paper to which I have alluded already:—⁵

The year has laid his mantle by,
 Acold and wet from winter's prison,
 And is in radiant vest uprisen
 Of sunshining embroidery.

No beasts nor birds but sing and cry
 In jargon at this merry season:
 The year has laid his mantle by,
 Acold and wet from winter's prison.

Rivers, and springs, and brooklets lie,
 New-liveried where the ice has wizen,
 And on the freshening leas they christen,
 Are silver studs for jewellery:
 The year has laid his mantle by,
 Acold and wet from winter's prison.

It has a lovely shape with its recurrent burden for which no vague rendering, however graceful, compensates; and were one tracing an analogy between the arts one might compare these formal poems—the Rondel, the Ballade, the Vilanelle, and so forth—to pieces of studied painting or of music. So we may find in 'genre' or landscape the prominent feature reproduced throughout the picture in form or colour, and so a phrase of tune recurs in the movements of a symphony, to destroy which were to destroy the very essence of the thing. I shall relieve these old-fashioned and descriptive ditties by an epigram from Clément Marot, the most illustrious poet of his school, who brings us into the sixteenth century. *To a Lady who had longed to see him*:—

She read my books until she felt indeed
 She saw me; then would see what, sooth, my face is.
 Yea, and hath seen it dark in greybeard weed,
 Yet stand I none the less in her good graces.
 O gentle heart! (for noble, maid, your race is,)

* M. Contanseau's version is really a confusion of two rondels; the one of spring
 'Le temps a laissé son manteau,'
 the other of summer:

'Les fourriers d'esté sont venus.'

* 'A Plea for certain Exotic Forms of Verse.' *Cornhill Magazine*, July, 1877.

You reason right ; this frame already grey,
 It is not I—it is my prisoning clay :
 And in the books you read which are my creatures,
 Your lovely eyes, in simplest truth I say,
 Saw better me than when you saw my features.

To head the writers of the sixteenth century, I have selected three distinctive pieces from Ronsard : (1) a fragment as given in Auguste Brachet's *Morceaux Choisis* :—

My pleasant youth is passed, and broken
 The strength of earlier days: for token
 My teeth are black, and white my head ;
 My nerves relaxed, so cold my body
 The blood that in my veins was ruddy
 Is nothing else than water red.

Farewell ! I feel my days decline ;
 No joy wherein my youth delighted
 Stays with me now in age benighted,
 Save only fire, and bed, and wine.
 My head is drowsed, and deaf, and dreary,
 With too long years and sickness weary,
 And straitened on all sides am I :
 Whether I stay or whether wander,
 Always I look behind and ponder
 If I shall see that Death draws nigh ;
 Who, mayhap, at this hour betideth,
 To lead me low, to where abideth
 Some Pluto I know nought about,
 Whose cave yawns wide for every mortal,
 With easy access at the portal,
 But thence one cometh never out.

(2) a sonnet in which, for duty's sake and not for satisfaction's, I have precisely retained the Alexandrines of the French :—

If I were Jupiter, Sinope, you should be
 Juno, my spouse divine ; if I were king of ocean,
 You should my Tethys be and guide the waters' motion
 And for your palace home possess the sounding sea.
 Or if the earth were mine, we two together, we
 Would rule earth's fruitful breast with many a righteous notion :
 Car-mounted, golden-tressed, enshrined in man's devotion,
 Along the world you'd ride, a very deity !

But no ! no god am I—can one like me be royal,
 Whom Heaven has only made to be your servant loyal ?
 At your fair hands alone I take mine enterprise.
 You for my good and ill through life are set above me :
 I will be Neptune, dear, if only you will love me,
 Be Jupiter, be king, find wealth and gain the skies.

And (3) a verse quoted by Sainte-Beuve as a 'couplet spirituel,' of which he might have said as he did of another little verse, ' cela vaut un grand poème : '—

Go forth, my song! thy goal remember,
 And, entering my lady's chamber,
 When her white hands thy kiss hath prest,
 Say, if to health she would restore me,
 She need but do this favour for me,
 To take and hide thee in her breast.

Two pastorals of Vauquelin de la Fresnaye, in their rare quaintness, may stand in contrast with that passionate fragment of Ronsard.

Among the lily flowers, to-day,
 How deep asleep my Phillis lay!
 And where her pretty face was showing,
 The little loves, a childish rout,
 Wantoned and played in mirth about,
 Seeing there the heavens reflected glowing.

I gazed upon her loveliness,
 Right worthy worship I confess,
 Till fancy whispered: 'Foolish lover,
 Why waste your time? for hours once lost
 Are often sold at countless cost:
 Oh! rarely come such hours twice over.'

Thereat I stoop my body low,
 I creep along upon tiptoe
 And kissed her lips of crimson beauty:
 So tasting such a good, I wis,
 As is the part in Paradise
 Of saintly souls devout in duty.

I have kept the tenses as in the original. In the next the changes rung by the double rhymes, which, coarsely as they represent the '*rimes féminines*,' I would on no account nor ever forego, will be still more perceptible. In translating such poems as this one cannot but fall to envying Chaucer and his contemporaries their store of quasi-dissyllabic rhyme, in such plurals as '*featys*' for '*feats*' and the mute final *e*, absolute correlative in look and sound to the feminine rhyme of the French.⁶

Soon as, with neighbour hinds, I've led
 My flocks and herds from stall and shed,
 I'll go to-morrow, pretty Frances,
 To sell a bullock at the fair
 And buy what serge the fashion fancies,
 To make a kirtle for your wear.

There will I buy bright knives for you,
 And scissors, and a girdle too,
 That purse with pincushion enhances;
 And these shall be my gifts. But smile,
 And kiss me, I pray thee, pretty Frances,
 Once and again this waiting while.

* When Chaucer uses the ballade stanza (of more or less than eight lines), it is noteworthy that he confines himself to the legitimate *three* rhymes.

Then come to-morrow evening back,
 When night puts on her garb of black,
 And fetch my presents, pretty Frances,
 Here in this copse; for surely thus
 Not all your mother's prying glances
 Shall guide her to discover us.

In English verse of the same period we have the same fanciful substance, and the same grace in divers arrangements of double and single rhymes. In its longing, as for its style and tone, we might compare Constable's old song,

Diaphenia like the daffadowndilly,

with these pastorals of Vauquelin. 'Comme presque partout, en poésies françaises ce sont les toutes petites choses qui restent les plus jolies.'

But these poems should have come into our anthology at a somewhat later date, for the *Avril* of Rémy Belleau, roughly handled too often, must by no means be passed over without comment. And anent this song I would explain further what I mean by the 'tests of usual reading and of music' whereby I proposed to decide the due accent of rhythm in English translations. This is clearest shown by examples. Here is a verse of the original:—

Avril, l'honneur et des bois,
 Et des mois;
 Avril, la douce espérance
 Des fruits qui, sous le coton
 Du bouton,
 Nourrissent leur jeune enfance.

Now what is noteworthy in that strophe (besides its exquisite rhyming) is that it reads and sings 'anapæstically' (although it may be hammered into 'spondees'), and there are at least two settings of the French words to music where the accent is on the second and not the first syllable throughout.⁷ My own translation of the song was made for singing to the song's own tune, but of course (being English) there is only one way to accent it—as anapæstic—the syllabic counting of French verse allowing choice. Mr. Lang's translation, however facile (counted apparently on the fingers and with none but single rhymes), will fit no familiar musical setting, and (also being English) will read only one way—this way:

April, pride of woodland ways
 And glad days.

Where the original seems to dance it marches; it is a dirge and not a carol. I will give a few verses with the same beat that the original

⁷ The traditional one in the *Echos du temps passé*, and a beautiful modern one by Mr. A. Thomas.

has (decided by my tests of 'usual reading and music') to show that it is a merrier measure than that:—

Sweet April, pride of the ways
 And the days,
 Sweet April, hope that art bringing
 To fruits on boughs, that beneath
 The bright sheath
 Of bud and of bloom are swinging.
 Sweet April, thine is the hand
 On the land,
 That gathers from Nature's bosom
 The harvest of many a scent,
 Dewy sprent,
 And balms earth and air with blossom.*
 The courteous winds of thy prime
 To our clime
 Make welcome every new-comer,
 The swallows that fly from afar,
 And that are
 The messengers of the summer.
 The nightingale with her song,
 All night long,
 Makes music in lonesome meadows,
 With many a trill of her love
 From above,
 As she sings amid the shadows.
 May boasts of fragrance to suit
 Her ripe fruit,
 And prospering dewfall's sweetness
 And manna she hath without fail,
 And the pale
 Brown honey to be her witness;
 But I forego not my praise
 Of these days,
 That take their name of her glory,
 Who rose, in beauty that grew
 Ever new,
 From foam of the sea-waves hoary.

So definitely 'anapaestic' a rendering opens up the wide question of rhythm in French verse which my tests imply, although a Frenchman would hardly comprehend it, insusceptible as is even the educated French ear to the sway of our rhythmic verse.⁹

At the risk of giving a poem for each month of spring, I find myself bound to quote Passerat's *First of May*, for the sake of its sad fate at Mr. Lang's hands, who gives it neither rhythmically nor syllabically, and, for a wonder, with all its force and colour gone from it.

* In my version published to music this stanza is done differently: here I must at all hazards be literal.

⁹ The space at my disposal compels me to omit the lovely *Avril* of Antoine de Baif which I had intended should figure as a companion or a rival.

Gounod's musical setting of these verses proves the real flexibility of French poetry, for in the last couplet of each stanza he shifts the accent, so that, in English, one must shift one's rhythm to follow him.

Oh, hence with sleep, and leave thy bed
 This radiant morning!
 For us the day her brows of red
 Is just adorning.
 And now that skies are fair and gay
 In this enchanted month of May,
 Love me, beloved!
 In gladness let us quench our fire;
 There's nought in life that's worth desire
 From it removed.

Come, through the woodlands walk with me,
 Where boughs are shady;
 And hear the birds' sweet minstrelsy,
 My lovely lady.
 But listen ever over all
 The nightingale rings musical
 And never weary;
 We'll lay aside our grief and care,
 And with the birds be blithesome there,
 Ere days be dreary.

Old Time, that heeds not lover's tears,
 Hath wings for flying,
 And, as he flies, our crowning years
 With him are hieing.
 When wrinkles thou one day shalt see,
 This burden to thy plaint will be:
 'Ah! foolish creature,
 Why have I ne'er proved beauty's sway
 That time so swiftly stole away
 From each fair feature?'

Hence! tears and sorrows, waste your spite
 On age that chides us;
 Still young we cull the blossoms bright
 That youth provides us.
 And, now that skies are fair and gay,
 In this enchanted month of May,
 Love me, beloved!
 In gladness let us quench our fire;
 There's nought in life that's worth desire
 From it removed.¹⁰

I have tried my hand also at Passerat's pretty *vilanelle*, of which Mr. Gosse speaks so highly; and here, despite the exigencies of the

¹⁰ To suit Gounod's music, the refrain of the first and last verses may run:—

 'In delight let us quench our fire;
 Nought is in the world worth desire.'

And of the second verse:—

 'Let us lay aside grief and care
 For the nightingale's gladness there.'

The third is not set.

rhyming, I have forborne to serve up compound and simple words—‘call’ and recall’ for instance—as rhymes, although inclining myself, with Mr. Swinburne, to regard ‘recall’ as not only a very good rhyme to ‘call,’ but, with the exception of ‘call’ itself, *quite the best*. I dare hardly claim for this translation any merit but its absolute faithfulness of form.

O my dove! what doth befall her?

Surely it is she I hear;

Fain I'd fly and fain recall her.

Plainest thou thy mate, poor brawler?

I, alas! bewail my dear.

O my dove! what doth befall her?

If thy heart's wound grows not smaller,

So my faith is still sincere;

Fain I'd fly and fain recall her.

Louder still thy murmurings, all her

Charms lament. I weep her here.

O my dove! what doth befall her?

Since I see not mine enthraller,

Nothing now can fair appear;

Fain I'd fly and fain recall her.

Death! no more my heart's appaller,

Take thy slave, I have no fear.

O my dove what doth befall her?

Fain I'd fly and fain recall her.

It was my intention, before going on to writers of the present epoch, to offer several passages from Millevoeye and others, where the ‘rimes masculines et féminines’ are interchanged at haphazard, for there the license is greater; but the necessity of giving several specimens from Hugo and de Musset to get any ‘taste of their quality’ induces me to cut down my examples (between the sixteenth and the nineteenth centuries) to one fable of La Fontaine's, a few verses of Gilbert's well-known ode, and two small ‘camei’ of André Chénier's finely finished work. The following fable is as well known, and so as easily criticised, as any: *The Monkey and the Cat*:—

Bertrand the wily ape, and Master Puss the cat,
Together shared a room and had one common master;
A merry mess indeed for the naughty beasts was that,
For, one with the other, they feared no sort of disaster.
If anything was found spoilt in their lodging there,
No need, I wot, to lay the blame upon the neighbours:
Bertrand stole everything, while Pussy, for his share,
Directed not so much to mice as cheese his labours.
At the fireside one day our two young tricksters are,
Where chestnuts roast upon the bar.

To steal these chestnuts, sooth, would be a fine employment:
The knaves see thus their way to reap twofold enjoyment—

To their own selves doing good, and harm to some one else.
 Said Bertrand then to Puss: 'My friend, to-day compels
 Your paws to victories serviceable :
 Draw forth these chestnuts—come! If Heaven had made me able
 To pull out chestnuts from the grate,
 Oh! cheery were the chestnuts' fate!'
 No sooner said than done: for Puss with claws began a
 Raid in the most consummate manner :
 Dispersed the ash a bit; pulled back his paws in pain,
 But put them in and in again.
 Snatched out one chestnut first, then two, then stole a third.
 'Crack!' Bertrand's teeth meanwhile were heard.
 At last a maid runs in: farewell, my boys! But Puss,
 They say, was scarce contented thus.

Neither, I think, is one at all among those princes
 Who, flattered by this sort of thing,
 On the provincial hot-bar wince
 For doing service to a king.

These next verses from Gilbert's famous ode, *After Many Psalms*, form a striking contrast to this 'naïve' fable; but there is near a hundred years between them. The stanzas I give are those quoted by M. Contanseau:—

My heart before the God of innocence I lay me,
 The tears I weep He doth behold :
 My sorrowing He hath healed, His shield and buckler stay me,
 The wretched are His care of old.

Blest be Thy name, my God, who gavest me for guerdon
 Innocence and its noble pride !
 Thou who, to guard the sleep that must this body burden,
 Wilt watch my desolate bier beside.

In life's gay feasting hall, a luckless reveller bidden
 One hour I sit, one hour I die :
 I die, and on the grave where soon I shall be hidden
 No man will come to heave a sigh.

Hail! fields I used to love: hail! hedges' leafy sweetness,
 And lonely, laughing woodland prime ;
 Heaven, canopy of earth, and nature's fine completeness,
 All hail! All hail, this one last time !

Ah! long may those my friends behold your hallowed beauty,
 Deaf though they be to my goodbyes !
 May they die full of days, bewept of tender duty !
 May one that loves them close their eyes !

While adhering strictly to the system proposed, I have tried in the last two excerpts to change the tone, so as to give somewhat of La Fontaine's colloquial ease of style in the one, and of Gilbert's sad earnestness in the other. In the following passages from Chénier I shall further try to contrast the artificial and the simple, the senti-

mental and the pathetic. This is the twelfth 'fragment' from the elegies, a translation itself from Ovid and not an original piece.

Fly hence, fly hence, my songs! in you my hopes abide,
Fly hence to touch her heart and disallow her pride!
Make moan and supplicate, implore, till peradventure
At length she suffer you before her face to enter.
Then go! and at her knees declare the dole ye bring,
With ashes on your brows bowed down in sorrowing;
And see no more again this wilderness my garden,
Until from her sweet mouth ye bring me gracious pardon.

And this the fourth fragment of the *Poésies diverses* :—

From native country torn, where friends and parents are,
Forgotten upon the earth, from all my kinsfolk far,
Cast hither by the sea on these rough shores that breaketh,
Hardly the happy name of France my lips forsaketh.
Lone at the darkling hearth I cower and weep my fate,
I pine for death, I count the moments while I wait,
With never a single friend to come with welcome cheery
To seat him at my side, and seeing my face so dreary,
Hang bathed in tears of grief down-drooping to my breast,
Say 'What's the matter then?' the while my hand he pressed.

The plaintive tone of this last quotation is amply accounted for by the comment that follows the lines preceding the fragment, to the effect that they were written 'couché et souffrant' on the steamer between Calais and Dover. They are none the less touching that their instigation is from sea-sickness, and they gain force when one remembers what the company of a friend was to Chénier on his death-day in the last trial when he stood with Roucher on the scaffold and they recited together the first scene from Racine's *Andromaque*. So friendship stole away from death his sting, and enthusiasm his pain : 'Il est si beau de mourir jeune !'

I cannot, be it understood, insist upon this method of translation as applied to the drama. The difference between a French and English Alexandrine, spoken, is too marked. They are as different indeed as the *look of the lines*. Their 'sing-song' in English unfits them quite for purposes of speech, unless in purely rhetorical passages, where the effect is too well known; but one has only to hear the swiftly-uttered French Alexandrines (of Racine for instance) declaimed by Mdlle. Sarah Bernhardt, to perceive that they are not weightier than our full iambic lines, always the best mould for dramatic speech in this language. With the sonnet too in these Alexandrines we shall never be pleased, although its shortness and the 'distraction' afforded by the arrangement of its rhymes may lessen the tedium. I have already given one from Ronsard (doing some violence to myself, as I cannot but prefer the French sonnet rendered, as Mr. Lang has rendered it, into the familiar English form), and I shall give another from de

Musset, as well as one in very short metre, and even a scene from his play *A quoi rêvent les jeunes filles?* where the monotony of the rhymed Alexandrines—intolerable else—is broken by a lyrical measure. Nor do such simple ballads as Béranger's repay this form of translation, more of the spirit of them being kept when there is no question of erudite order, and the rhymes fall as things of chance. This is what I meant at starting when I said that the literal method of reproduction was better instanced in 'fine' work than 'broad.'

In the present century there is such bewildering store of matter that I have decided to insert here only examples from Victor Hugo and Alfred de Musset, at once the test and the terror of a translator; but I shall separate them by one metrical study from Théophile Gautier, and one from the work of a modern French poetess, the Comtesse de Castellana, as severally representative of the French styles of finished work and songs for singing.¹¹ Here then are my examples from Victor Hugo, without ado of needless introduction.

1. From *The Easterns*—'The Veil,' a poem of great concentration and full of local colour. Its motto is from Shakespeare: 'Have you prayed to-night, Desdemona?'

THE SISTER.

What ails, what ails you so, my brothers,
That thus you bend your brows in care?
Like lamps funereal darkness smothers,
The glances from your eyelids glare.
Your belts hang all unloosed around you,
Already thrice have leapt in play
The falchion blades wherewith you have bound you,
Half glancing from their sheaths away.

THE ELDEST BROTHER.

Have you not lifted up that veil of yours to-day?

THE SISTER.

Returning from the bath, my brothers,
My lords, returning from the bath,
Hidden from gaze of Giaours and others
—The rough Albanians—in my path,
Just as I passed the mosque, I mind me,
In mine uncovered palanquin,
I loosed the swathing folds that bind me,
And let warm airs of noonday in.

THE SECOND BROTHER.

A man passed then? a man in caftan dyed with green.

THE SISTER.

'Tis very like; but all his boldness
Has never seen my features bare . . .
But look, you speak with tones of coldness,
With coldness you are muttering there.

¹¹ My intention was to have added one example, if not more, from my versions of Nadaud's songs, but as some at least of these may be found elsewhere published to music I have decided to omit them.

Must you have blood? I swear that no man
 Could see—yes, by your souls I am right.
 Pardon! my brothers, shield a woman
 Who stands so helpless in your sight!

THE THIRD BROTHER.

Methinks the sun was red at sunset to-night.

THE SISTER.

Pardon! what have I done? Oh pardon!
 God! there are four wounds in my side!
 Nay! by your knees I fall thus hard on . . .
 My veil! my veil so white and wide!
 Fly not my hands this blood is staining;
 Brothers, assist my faltering breath;
 Across mine eyes whose glance is waning
 Extends itself the pall of death.

THE FOURTH BROTHER.

A veil at least is that, no hand upgathereth.

2. From the *Autumn Leaves* :—

Before the songs I joy in singing,
 So young, such wafts of perfume bringing,
 Endured the brunt the world allows,
 Far from the crowd and all its crushing,
 Ah! how they bloomed, a garland blushing,
 How green and fragrant, on my brows!

Now torn from off the tree that beareth,
 Flowers which the blighting northwind teareth,
 —Like a dream's leavings pitiable—
 They wander, scattered hither and thither,
 In dustiness and mud to wither,
 At the winds' and the waters' will.

And like dead leaves in autumn showered,
 I see them, of their bloom deflowered,
 Blown all along the barren lea;
 The while a crowd that presses round me,
 And treads to earth the wreath that crowned me,
 Goes laughing at the naked tree.

And the first four verses of the *Prayer for all* (Ora pro nobis) :—

My daughter, hence and pray! see, night is stealing o'er us,
 Golden the planet dawns to pierce the clouds before us:
 Grey mist now veils the hills—ah! faint, ah! vague are they;
 And scarce one distant wheel rolls through the shadows. Listen!
 All seek their rest at home, and where the highways glisten,
 The trees to evening winds shake out the dust of day.

And twilight, opening forth night's realm the stars that hideth,
 Bids each bright orb declare where each in light abideth;
 The gradual fringes red in western skies decay;
 Like silver in the shade, the night of waves is showing;
 Furrows, and hedge, and wood, all indistincter growing,
 Until the traveller misdoubts him of the way.

The day for evil is, for weariness and anger.
 Pray : for the night is here serene in calm and languor !
 The shepherd old, the winds through ruinous towers that sweep,
 The waterpools, the flocks, with hoarse and broken bleating,
 All suffer, all complain. The land at length is treating
 Her long fatigue to love, to worship and to sleep.

And angels at this hour unfold to babes their treasures,
 The while we haste away to seek our empty pleasures,
 And little children now, with eyes upturned above,
 Bared feet and folded hands, upon the pavement praying,
 All at this selfsame hour, one selfsame prayer are saying ;
 Pray God forgive our sins—' our Father ' God of love !

And 3. From the *Songs of Twilight* three pieces of diverse metre, which illustrate three distinct phases of Victor Hugo's lyrical genius—the song :—

Hope, child ! to-morrow ! Hope ! and then again to-morrow,
 And then to-morrow still ! Trust in a future day.
 Hope ! and each morn that skies new light from dawn shall borrow,
 As God is there to bless, let us be there to pray.

Our faults, poor angel mine, are cause of our affliction.
 Perhaps if on our knees we rest incessant thus,
 When on the innocent God pours His benediction,
 And the repentant, last He will remember us.

A portion of the metrical study—*Morning*—where the value of this plan of rendering should be particularly apparent :—

Glances morning hither,
 Now the shade is past ;
 Dream and fog fly thither
 Where night goes at last ;
 Open eyes and roses
 Which the darkness closes ;
 And the sound that grows is
 Nature waking fast.

Murmuring all and singing,
 Hark ! the news is stirred,
 Roof and creepers clinging,
 Smoke and nest of bird ;
 Winds to oaktrees bear it,
 Streams and fountains hear it
 Every breath and spirit
 As a voice is heard.

All takes up its story,
 Child resumes his play,
 Hearth its ruddy glory,
 Lute its lifted lay.
 Wild or out of senses,
 Through the world immense is
 Sound as each commences
 Schemes of yesterday.¹²

¹² So slight quotation means no undervaluing of the poem, but merely that I grudge to such short lines the space they occupy.

And the *Lowly Flower*—a lovely specimen of pure ‘poet’s poetry :’—

To the light butterfly said thus the lowly flower :
 ‘Fly not so !
 Here am I fain to rest (how diverse is our dower !)
 Thou canst go !

‘Yet is love ours, we dwell far from each human creature
 —None are nigh—
 And yet is likeness ours, for both are flowers by feature,
 Thou and I.

‘But me, alas ! the earth enchains while wind conveys thee—
 Cruel care !
 I long to embalm thy wing with scent upbreathed to praise thee
 Through the air.

‘But no ! too far thy flight, mid flowerets of the meadow
 Lies thy way,
 While lonely, round my stem I watch my turning shadow
 All the day.

‘Thou fliest and thou return’st, then fliest to shine to-morrow
 Otherwhere,
 And every dawn again beholdest me for sorrow
 Bathed in tears.

‘Oh ! that our love may pass some days in peaceful gliding,
 Sovran mine !
 Take thou a root like me, or give me wings dividing
 Just as thine !’

ENVOI TO * * *

Roses and butterflies, the tomb must reunite us
 Soon or late.
 Why then await the tomb ? Let some brief while delight us,
 Mate with mate.

Some brief while heavenwards bent, if flight thy gentle pleasure
 High in air !
 Or, in the meadows if thy chalice spills its treasure
 Even there !

Where’er thou wilt ! what care have I ? yea, be thou breath or
 Colouring,
 Butterfly gaily dyed, or flower in fostering weather,
 Bloom or wing !

To live together ! this the one prime needful leaven
 For life’s worth ;
 Afterwards we can choose at hazard, if in heaven
 Or on earth !

The *Emaux et Camées* of Gautier, which form a most attractive and tantalising subject for translation, have afforded me the next poem upon *Art*. It is the one selected as sample of them by Mr. James in his interesting volume of essays on *French Poets and Novelists*, where he speaks of it in very fortunate terms as almost

'tinged with intellectual passion,' for 'it is the distinct statement,' he says, 'of Gautier's intellectual belief . . . æsthetic conviction that glows with a moral fervour.'

Yes, the work comes excelling
From substance to the hold
Rebelling,
Verse, marble, onyx, gold.

No false constraint I crave for :
But Muse, to walk, you need
To have your
Buskin to fit indeed.

Fie on an easy metre !
'Tis like too large a shoe
All feet are
Able to get into !

Nay, sculptor, do not linger
O'er clay you idly mould
With finger,
While mind stands out acold !

Fight with Carrara's quarries,
With Paros stone that sure
And rare is ;
These guard the outlines pure

Sicilian bronze procure you.
What features sweet or fierce
Allure you,
Firmly therethrough shall pierce.

In veins of agate follow
A face with skilful hand :
Apollo
Shall glance at your command.

Fly water-colour painting,
And fix your pigments fast
From fainting
At the hot oven's blast.

Make the blue Siren songsters,
Twisting their tails awry ;
The monsters
Of blazoned heraldry.

Or in their threesfold glory
The Virgin and her Son ;
Or story
Of what the cross hath done.

All pass : to art Fate giveth
Long life alone of all ;
Outliveth
The bust a city's fall.

Hard coin a workman steals us
 Out of earth's prisoning
 Reveals us
 The features of a king.

The very gods are waning:
 Lo! still verse royal is
 Remaining
 Past brazen images.

Be thy work carved on, graved in,
 So shall vague dreams sublime
 Be saved in
 Blocks that outrival Time.

That is an instance where I have felt myself bound to be not only rhythmically but syllabically accurate throughout. If one's ears are not charmed as with Gautier's own music, one sees at least the precise shape and size of the poem, and apprehends its laboured and exquisite 'finish,' which no other form would quite avail to show.

I have chosen the following translation of Madame de Castellana's *Vous et Moi*, as a short and facile sample of the typical modern song, to contrast with Gautier's elaboration, and introduce some echo of a special feminine charm:—

Your eyes, serene and pure, have deigned to look upon me,
 Your hand, a fluttering bird, has lingered in my hands;
 And yet the words I would—alas!—have all foregone me,
 Because your way and mine lie through such alien lands.

You are the rising sun that fair day follows after,
 And I the deep of night, the gloomy clouds and grey:
 You are a flow'r, a star, a burst of tuneful laughter,
 I am December drear, and you the merry May!

You steep yourself in rays and breathe the breath of roses,
 For you are dawn of day and I the twilight set;
 Needs must we say farewell, ere time the why discloses,
 For you are very Love, and I am Love's regret.

We have reached de Musset at last; for though he should perhaps have preceded Victor Hugo as the past precedes the present, he seems always the youngest of all poets by reason of the pervading air of youth that hangs about his verses, sad or gay. He was spoken of more fitly and fairly as a 'child (than as a dwarf)-Byron.' I had lief say much about his work, had I space left to speak of him, but he speaks best for himself, so I would refer my readers to the book of Mr. James's that I have already mentioned (in an allusion to Gautier) for an appreciative and sufficient English essay upon his qualities as a poet.

The following 'impromptu,' made for answer to the question of Louise Bertin, 'What is poetry?' may serve well enough for

starting-point. Though it has perhaps least of de Musset's felicity of musical expression, its intention is expressive of his own.

To scout mere memories, and bid the thought be holden
Kept balanced ever safe, on some bright centre golden,
Nor once let wander thence, though fierce and quick it seem ;
To give eternity to a single moment's dream ;
To love the true, the fair, and seek for their fruition,
While hearkening deep at heart the echoes of his vision ;
To sing, laugh, weep, alone, without an aim, at chance ;
And from a single word, a smile, a sigh, a glance,
To forge his perfect work, most terrible, most tender,
To turn a tear to a pearl of splendour :
Herein is manifest the poet's living fire,
This is the good his goal, his life and his desire.

There could scarcely be better witness of the truth of this— taking the word 'poetry,' of course, in a limited lyrical sense—than any one of his own songs, this for instance :—

Warrior fair, to the battle-field going,
What are you doing
So far from me ?
Do you not see that the dark night is lonely,
In the world only
Is grief to dree ?
You that believe that a love once forsaken
Her flight has taken
From memories,
Heyday ! heyday ! you that seek where fame's crown is,
Look ! your renown is
Like smoke that flies.
Warrior fair, to the battle-field going,
What are you doing
Far from my feet ?
I must go weep, whom you told when beguiling,
How that my smiling
Was all too sweet.

Or this, which might be Moore :—

When one has lost, by sad annoyance,
One's hope of joyance
And one's delight,
The remedy for melancholy
Is music holy
And beauty bright !

More wins and more compels our duty
A face of beauty
Than strong man armed,
And best to song our griefs we render,
Song sweet and tender
Erewhile that charmed !

Or this, which *must* be Heine :—

See, my neighbour's window curtain
 Moves as if she lifted it !
 And she will, I'm almost certain,
 Take the air for a bit.

Now the casement open blowing—
 Ah ! I feel my breath to catch.
 For perhaps she would be knowing
 If I am on the watch.

But, alas ! 'tis idle dreaming ;
 For my neighbour loves a lout,
 And it is the wind that's seeming
 To push the curtain out.

After three songs I cannot give less than two sonnets, in contrasted rhythmical form. I have spoken of both already. The first is the *au lecteur* of the *Premières Poésies* :—

This book has all my youth inside it ;
 I made it ere I gave a thought.
 That's clear enough, even I descried it,
 And might have changed it, had I sought.

But while man changes far and wide, it
 Were best, methinks, to alter nought.
 Hence the poor bird of passage, brought
 To rest at last where God shall guide it !

Whoe'er thou art that readest me,
 Read all thou canst read patiently,
 And till thou hast read me spare thy curses.
 My first songs are a child's, in sooth,
 The next but singing of a youth,
 The last are scarcely fullgrown verses.

And this next, an early poem too, I have preferred to any I have translated from his later volume as more distinctive of de Musset, here rather as a Parisian than a poet :—

How well I love this first keen shivery winter feeling !
 The frozen stubble, stiff beneath the sportsman's tread,
 The magpie, where o'er fields the garner scent is stealing,
 And deep in ancient halls the wakening embers red ;
 Now is the time for town ! Oh, just a year has fled
 Since I returned and saw great Louvre her dome revealing,
 Queen Paris with her smoke no goodliest charm concealing
 (Still rings the drivers' cry, as fast their horses sped).

I loved this ashen time, these passers by the river,
 Beneath her thousand lamps, reclined as sovereign ever !
 I came to winter back—and back, my life, to thee !
 Oh ! in thy languorous glance I felt to swoon already ;
 I hailed thy very walls. . . For who could tell, my lady,
 That in so little while thine heart had changed for me ?

I am very sorry to be able to offer no better substitute for 'Madame' than 'my lady.' 'Bad's the best,' and 'my lady,' if a little vulgar, is

at least nearer the mark than 'my queen.' Apropos of this 'Madame,' one may plead, for a certain sameness of rhyme that must come with English dissyllables, no less an excuse than the *sameness of rhyme in French*. One is pretty certain to find 'âme' where one sees a line that ends 'Madame,' and if it is not 'âme' it is 'flamme.'

I must add one rondeau of de Musset's, though of the Rondeau-form itself I need say nothing after Mr. Gosse: this example is fuller of assonance than a rondeau is bound to be, for the refrain is related to the lines (as in another rondeau in the same volume) instead of being wholly independent of them. I have tried to reproduce this assonance in my English version.

There never was, my heart, a sweeter aching
Than thine, when Manon sleeps in mine embrace!
The pillow all her tresses' perfume has;
In her fair breast I hear her heart still waking,
While dreams divert her to and fro that pass.
So sleeps the wild rose in the summer, as
A palace for the bee her petals making:
I rock her, I, methinks a dearer place
There never was!

But the day dawns, and rosy morn, outshaking
Her springtide flowers, enchants the winds. Alas!
With comb in hand, her pearlèd eardrops taking,
Manon forgets me quite before the glass.
Ah! love with no to-morrow and no forsaking
There never was!

It is because he is the poet of youth, I suppose, that one finds oneself smiling over de Musset's sorrows, and growing grave over his laughter: for after it the veil must be lifted up which he never lived to lift, the illusions dispelled which, for his muse at least, were fresh until the end.

I had meant to give the whole of the first scene from his charming comedy *A quoi rêvent les jeunes filles?* rendered in this tentative fashion, but want of space forbids it, and I am fain to detach some mere lines of the delightful idyll, just for the sake of hazarding the interpolated song, surely the loveliest of all de Musset's singing:

NINON. [*Alone, drawing the bolt*]
With spurs of silver and a cloak of velvet stuff!
A chain! and then a kiss! A strange adventure rather.

[*She lets down her hair.*]

This headdress suits me ill—my hair's not long enough.
Bah! I had guessed aright!—it doubtless was my father.
Ninette is such a goose!—He saw her passing there.
Yes! 'tis quite clear, his child, what harm in kissing her?
How well my bracelets look! [*She undoes them*]

Of that young man I'm thinking,
The stranger who comes here to-morrow night to dine,
A husband whom they mean to get us, I opine.
How droll it sounds! I feel even now a sort of shrinking.

What gown shall I put on? [*She goes to bed*]

I think a summer dress.

No: winter, for that gives an air that's more befitting—

No: summer, that looks young, and also studied less.

Between us two, no doubt, at table he will be sitting,

My sister please him best?—bah! always—we shall see! . . .

So, spurs of silver and a velvet cloak had he!

Heav'n's! for an autumn night this heat is most oppressing.

I must sleep anyway. Did not I hear a sound?

'Tis Flora coming back; no—no one, that's a blessing.

Tra la, tra deri da! What peace in bed is found!

How hideous my aunt looked, in those old tufts of feather,

Last night at supper time! How white it is, my arm!

Tra deri da—moustache!—my eyelids close together—

He 'strains her to his breast, then flies as in alarm.'

[*She drowns. Through the window a guitar is heard and a voice sings.*]

THE VOICE. Ninon, Ninon, why pass thy life in sorrow?

Fast flies the hour, and day treads hard on day.

A rose to-night, and fallen to-morrow,

How canst thou live that hast no lover? say!

NINON. [*Awaking*] Is this a dream? methought, outside one sang his lay.

THE VOICE (*without*). Consider thee, thou maiden youthful,

Thine heart beats; thy bright eyes are truthful;

To-day thy springtide is, Ninon, to-morrow frost.

What! thou that hast no star, must thou at sea be tossed?

Journey without a book? go trumpetless to battle?

What! thou that hast no love, of living wilt thou prattle?

I, for a little love, would lay my lifetime down;

Yea, lay down life for nought, were life without love's crown.

NINON. No: I am not deceived—full strangely sounds the singing!

And—how to account for this?—the singer knows my name.

Perhaps she too is called 'Ninon' that is his flame.

THE VOICE. What boots it that to-day should end, a new day bringing—

When all the heart is ringing

With life-tide mutual proved?

Blossom and blow, young flowers! If death should spoil your gleaming,

Our life is but a sleep, and love its sweetest dreaming,

And well you shall have lived, if you have lived and loved.

I have scarcely given as yet a fair example of the poet's satire, where it rings real, for, of course, in the mere songs it is playful enough. In the following verses *On a Dead Woman* we have it perhaps at its strongest:—

Yes: she was fair, if Night is so—

If Night the dusky chapel keepeth

(Carven of Michel Angelo)

Can be called fair the while she sleepeth;

Yes: she was good, if good be wroght

By hands that give in careless fashion

Without God's seeing or saying aught,

If gold makes alms without compassion;

Yes : and she thought, if when there rings
 Sound of a sweet voice tuned to laughter
 Like the light brook that bounds and sings,
 We dare to trust that thought lies after ;

Yes : and she prayed, if two fair eyes
 Now to the ground their glances bending,
 And now uplifted to the skies,
 Can be called prayer without offending ;

Yes : she had smiled, if in the grove
 Young flow'rs could burst the bonds that fret them,
 And open to the freshness of
 The winds that pass and that forget them.

Yes : she had wept, if hands we lay
 Crossed cold on heart that heaves not even,
 Had felt but once in human clay
 Such dews of grace as fall from Heaven.

Yes : she had loved, were't not that pride,
 Like some poor useless lamp, uplighted
 To burn a funeral bier beside,
 Watched always at her heart benighted ;

Yes : she is dead, whose lips were stirred
 By no live breath to living glory :
 Out of her hands has dropt the story,
 Whereof she never read a word.

For the verses to *Pépa*, the *Rappelle-toi*, and other test pieces, I had hoped in vain to find room ; they will, however, appear elsewhere in company, I hope, with some completer version of de Musset's longer pieces. With regard to the verses *To Juana*, without which no selection from his writing can be quite characteristic—for they are the breath of his very self—I have something more to say. It is not worth while to speak of most translations of them ; but, at the risk of bruising what is too fragile to be so dealt with, I must say thus much of Mr. Lang's (and we must bear in mind that it is the only sample of de Musset's work in his collection) : he has sacrificed the poet to the production (in his name) of a graceful little English poem—some pretty verses of regret—without one spark of the original's distinctive qualities. For the keynote of the French poem is its irony and smart. The very first line of it, “O ciel, je vous revois—Madame !” contains a change from passionate surprise to courteous satire—indeed in his work of this sort, where these are not, there is not de Musset. So here is my literal, if I grant unmusical, version :¹³

¹³ That I may not seem to speak with no due deference of Mr. Lang, let me confess that I like his poem—for it is his—but that the first line of it, ‘Again I see you, ah my queen’ is no equivalent for the line quoted above ; that ‘c’était, je crois, l’été dernier’ is not ‘How the last summer days were blest ;’ that ‘ma vieille maîtresse’ . . . is not ‘How old we are ere spring be green’—nor ‘je m’éveillais tous les quarts d’heure’ ‘all night I lay awake.’ Least of all is the wonderful line

Oh Heavens! I see thee again, my lady!

Of all my soul has loved already

The first and far the tenderest yet.

Say, does your heart recall our story?

For me I keep it in its glory:

Last summer—if I don't forget!

Ah Madam, when we think upon it,

That foolish time of ours that's gone, it

Escapes as if it had not been.

Old mistress mine, do you remember,

—It seems a jest!—come next December,

I shall be twenty, and you eighteen?

Well, well! my love, I do not flatter;

And if my rose be pale, what matter,

So she retain her beauty's pride?

Child! never yet in Spanish city

Was head so empty, nor so pretty—

Do you recall that summer-tide?

Our evenings, and our famous quarrel?

You gave me then, to point the moral,

Your golden necklace for my bliss,

And three long nights, on my existence,

I woke at each ten minutes' distance

Only to see it and to kiss!

And your confounded old duenna!

That daylong frolic of Gehenna—

My pearl of Andalusia,

While your young lover died of pleasure,

The old Marquis, jealous of his treasure,

Of envy nearly died that day!

Ah lady! but beware, I pray you,

This love of ours, for all you say, you

Shall find again in other days.

The heart that once your spell enchaineth,

Juana, no other love profaneth;

None vast enough to fill your place.

What do I say? The world's in motion.

How should I wrestle with the ocean,

Whose waters have no backward flow?

Close eyes and arms and heart already;

Farewell, my life! Farewell, my lady!

This the world's motion here below.

Time flies; and on his track there follow

The flying feet of spring and swallow,

And life, and days we both let go;

All fast upborne as smoke that flieth,

Hope and the fame for which it sigheth,

You, whose sweet heart no memory trieth,

And I, my love, that loved you so!

'Adieu ma vie, adieu madame,' 'Farewell, farewell, so must it be.' The last verse of Mr. Lang's poem is so nice that it seems pedantic to add that 'fumée' is not 'spray,' and that 'you that not remember it' is hardly modern English.

Not but that de Musset could write a farewell, when he would, without satire or fever; only then it was a better thing than Mr. Lang's *Juana*, having less repining in its tone and more strength and more love. That he could write such a 'goodbye' let this last quotation show. Every *nuance* of the metre, even the halting of it, has its value, and I shall reproduce them carefully. The whole of the little serious poem is a sigh, and it blinds the eyes for further reading.

Farewell! for while this life besets me
 With you I feel I shall not dwell.
 God passing calls you and forgets me,
 In losing you I learn I loved you well.

No tears, no plaint all unavailing.
 What is to come I may not rue.
 So, speed the vessel for your sailing,
 And I will smile when it departs with you!

Forth fare you, full of hope; high-hearted
 You will return again to shore;
 But those who suffer most when you're departed,
 You will not see them any more.

Farewell! You go a pleasant dreaming,
 To drink your fill of dangerous delight;
 The star that now upon your path is beaming
 Shall dazzle yet awhile your wistful sight.

One day you *will* learn, to your profit,
 To prize a heart that feels for one,
 The good we find in knowing of it,
 And . . . what we suffer when it's gone.

Such as they are, the translations which form the bulk of this paper are my work, selected almost at haphazard from a quantity of material which might perhaps have afforded me fairer samples, but that I have chosen them rather for their accuracy than intrinsic skill. They were put together at various times and at the request mostly of musicians; that there should have been such demand is their sanction, and there needs always, to my mind, be some such warrant for the existence of translations at all. 'In the world they fill up a place which may be better supplied, when'—from whatever cause, the spread of taste or the much-vaunted culture—'they have made it empty.'

WILLIAM M. HARDINGE.

RELIGIOUS FAIRS IN INDIA.

CHAUCER'S *Canterbury Tales* have made us familiar with the pilgrimages of the middle ages in Europe. Those of the Hindus continue now what they were in the time of Chaucer and for centuries before. It is chiefly in autumn that the fairs on the sacred streams are held, particularly on the banks of the Ganges and the Nerbudda. The places are consecrated by poetry or tradition, as the scene of some divine work or manifestation.

These fairs, and the pilgrimages to them, are at once festive and holy. Every person who comes enjoys himself as much as possible. At the same time they all seek purification from sin by bathing and praying in the holy stream, just as the merry pilgrims to the shrine of St. Thomas at Canterbury sought absolution by praying at his shrine. It is expected of course that laudable resolutions will be made, at the same time, for the future, and if those resolutions are not kept, why, humanity is frail:—

Thanne longen folk to gon on pilgrimages,
And palmers for to seeken straunge strondes,
To ferne halwes,¹ kouth in sondry londes;
And specially, from every schires ende
Of Engelond, to Canturbury they wende,
The holy blissful martyr for to seeke,
That hem hath holpen whan that they were seeke.

The motives and the procedure are similar in the East now.

Vishnu is supposed to descend into the nether world (Putal) to attack and oppose Indur. There he stays four months, from June to October, and, during those months, festivities are suspended. But at the date of the reappearance, which depends upon the moon, all the world of Hinduism assembles with glee to hail his resurrection. The intense heat has passed away. All nature is rejoicing.

When the *mela*, or religious fair, is about to take place, the merchants congregate first with their wares. They establish themselves under shady trees, and expose their goods for sale. Horses, elephants, camels, bullocks, buffaloes, cows and donkeys; different kinds of cloth, ornaments, sweetmeats, and a variety of wares are thus exposed for sale. Thousands congregate around. The women are no longer

¹ To distant holy places known in sundry lands.

veiled, and seem glad to have the opportunity of seeing and being seen. Happy excitement characterises the family for days before the great event. Food is prepared. If food be prepared with ghee (clarified butter) or oil, it may be removed to any distance, and eaten anywhere, provided it be not profaned by unholy hands. It is *pukka* food. But food not wholly dressed in ghee or oil is *kutchā*, or *kachchā*, and would be rendered unclean by removal.

Attired in their best clothes—the women with all their ornaments on—they start in every kind of conveyance, but chiefly in carts drawn by oxen, for the scene of the fair. Some have conveyances for their women and children only, and walk themselves. A few on horses, camels, or elephants, are seen wending their way along. The women are still veiled and concealed. But, once arrived at the happy goal, all such restraints are thrown aside. ‘If a scrupulous respect and delicacy towards the female sex are points that denote civilisation,’ said Sir Thomas Munro, and with truth, ‘then the Hindus are not inferior in civilisation to the people of Europe.’

Hundreds of thousands assemble at some of these fairs. The women display themselves in all the bravery of their fine and many-tinted attire, with tinkling ornaments. Children are dressed in their finest clothes, with gold and silver rings about their wrists and ankles. Men with white or dyed turbans and caps, mostly too with long coats and waist-cloths, display themselves to the best advantage, usually carrying swords, or staves, or ornamental sticks. Only the few comparatively have tents, the families usually encamp under the mango trees, their conveyances near, and they sing and chat merrily round their fires at night. The Hindus learned first from the Mohammedans to conceal and veil their women, and the practice soon became fashionable amongst them. But at religious gatherings that practice is altogether renounced, and they revel in their new-found freedom, and know how to use it.

Bathing and the reciting of special prayers, or names of the Deity, in the water, are the most usual acts of devotion at these *melas*. As soon as the bathing is over, they walk to the temple close by, bow to the idol, repeat a few short ejaculatory prayers or invocations, and then retire, making an offering as they go. They constantly repeat the name of some deity, such as ‘Ram, Ram,’ with monotonous iteration, as they go to and return from the bathing-place.

Whilst the majority of the members of a family are gone to the bathing-place, one or two are left behind to take care of the property brought with them, for thieves and rogues abound in the *melas* as elsewhere. When the morning’s devotions and meal have been finished, the men go strolling about to see the fun of the fair, the women remaining behind, sitting under the trees, gazing at the unwonted sights, and often singing to beguile the monotony of the day. Children are often lost at these *melas*, some snatched and drowned in

bathing by diver-thieves, for the sake of their ornaments, others lost or kidnapped. The custom of putting large quantities of gold or silver on the children, in the shape of ornaments, renders it necessary that they should be well watched. Some of the thieves dive skilfully under the water, and carry off a poor wondering child before its guardians or itself become aware of its danger. An alligator is then said to have been the destroyer.

Would any one grudge them the pleasures of their annual *mela*? (asks Mr. Routledge). Perhaps it is not refined, perhaps not very enlightened; but they evidently enjoy it, as they sit and laugh and chat at their tent doors. For two long miles it is one perpetual scene of—what shall we call it?—enjoyment. Yes, without doubt, it is enjoyment, and of a kind that we have no right to interfere with, for it is as staid, as respectable, as decorous, as an Exeter Hall meeting. Nobody runs against anybody else intentionally. No rude boys jostle the women, as they do in High Street, Islington, London. The women, tired as many of them seemed to be, carried big babies, some of whom could have walked as well as their mothers, and evidently carried them too without a murmur. Low, debasing, brutalising! Very likely, but we saw nothing of all that. A remarkable phase of human nature, resting on old traditions of old sacred books, extending back through the mist of ages, and yet containing as little of the sacred and the solemn as it is easy to conceive in the way of a festival. Of course one ought to be shocked at the Jugganauth Car. It is proper and respectable to be so, and we are really very sorry that, after trying our best to be so, we could not be shocked. We tried hard, looking as gruff as possible, tried to feel sour too, but the sight of those wee lads and lassies growing up, of those men and women, happy after their own fashion for a day or two, drove all the grimness and gravity away. One thing alone we missed of the attractions of an English fair—there was not *one* grog-shop, *not one* tent licensed to sell foreign and British spirits, wholesale or retail. Strange to say, too, over the whole line of road, amid many thousands of revellers, we did not see one person *worse for liquor*.

One of the most picturesque of these gatherings is the Pokur fair, near Ajmere, in Rajputana. The lake of Pokur is a holy lake, and the various classes that assemble there in October every year to wash away their sins are picturesque and variegated. Gentlemen Thakurs come from the wilds of Marwar and Bikanir, portly Seths from Jey-pore, ferocious-looking Afghans from beyond the Khyber Pass, attenuated opium-eaters from Malwa, camel-breeders from Sind, Parsis from Nussirabad, and British officers, civil, political, and military, from all the neighbouring country, assemble here; for devotion some, and some for trade, and some to satisfy curiosity, like ourselves. Mussulman, Hindu, and Christian all meet here, and greet each other with affected cordiality.

The lake and city of Pokur are situated in a vast tract of sand entered from the Aravelli range. The shining lake, with its many twinkling lotus flowers, the gilded summits and whited walls of the Hindu temples, the multitudes of gaily-dressed people, and the rugged mountains that fill up the background, form a picture which, once seen, is never likely to be forgotten.

Arrived within the *mela*, the noise is deafening. Roars as if from exasperated lions, groans as from dying giants, the bellowing of buffaloes, the lowing of oxen, the neighing of horses, the braying of mules and asses, the barking of dogs, the shrill calling of women, and the shouting of men form a chorus of most admired confusion, sufficient to give the most *blasé* Londoner a new sensation. The European is quite bewildered with the din. He is at a loss to account for the uproar. Those acquainted with the camel, however, soon recognise many of the unearthly sounds as coming from him. He is a ventriloquist, and manufactures fearful sounds deep down in his interior, far below the region of the vocal organs that serve other less favoured animals with noise-producing powers.

For miles over the plain little is to be seen in the distance but herds of camels, noisy Indian camels of all kinds, roaring, groaning, gasping, hissing, bubbling, belching, moaning, and bellowing. Religion is the ostensible cause of the gathering—bathing in the holy Pokur lake—but advantage is taken of the festival to make it a grand cattle mart, and, of the cattle disposed of, camels form the larger portion. Mild, patient animals, the camels, Europeans think them, Europeans fresh from the study of Buffon, Goldsmith, and Wood. When a purchaser desires a nearer inspection of a camel, or when it becomes necessary to seize and load it, then the noise made by that individual camel is appalling. The patient animal will often seize with its teeth the innocent purchaser, or the servant who is loading it, inflicting terrible wounds.

Passing from the herds of camels, we dive into the space appropriated to bullocks, a space somewhat smaller than that allotted to the camels, but not *much* smaller. The bullocks chew the cud, and look apathetically upon all the fun of the fair—animals very much more patient they than the camels. But the ox is a sacred animal to the Hindu, and the bullock is apparently conscious that a certain odour of sanctity appertains to him. Perhaps he feels satisfied in his mind, knowing that it is not his fate to be killed and eaten, like his big brother of Europe. He certainly indulges in a gravity of demeanour that does not belong to the bullocks of other countries. Something may be due to the effect of climate and Hindu breeding. The lamb and the goat do not skip and play so merrily in India as their brethren of Europe. It might have been the sand, but certainly the lambs at Pokur fair did not ‘skip like fairies,’ nor did they ‘lick the hand just raised to shed their blood,’ as the poet asserts is the wont of lambs in England.

The most favourite lounge in the fair, for Europeans, Afghans, Pathans, and Arabs, is the horse market. There was a large collection of almost all kinds of horses, the very inferior descriptions vastly preponderating. The Thakurs of the native states of Marwar, Jeypore, and Meywar breed horses extensively, and bring them to

Pokur fair for sale. Large country-bred mares were most sought after, although some good Arab and Persian horses from Bushire and Bussorah, from Muscat and Oman, were there also. The country-bred mares will do more work than the more slightly built Arab, particularly in the sandy plains of Rajputana. For military purposes the mares and geldings are more efficient than entire horses. They are more tractable and enduring.

The air and gait of the Thakurs, as gentlemen horse-dealers, are exquisite. The indifference and nonchalance with which they lounge about, as if, although willing to sell, they were by no means anxious about the matter! Around each man's tent his stud is picketed. During the first days of the *mela* they will hardly answer a question about the price. They were not brought there for sale, or, if it was admitted that they were, a fancy price was asked. By-and-by whole batches of them were bought at reasonable prices by officers for Government purposes. A thousand rupees would be asked for an animal worth less than half that amount. Three, four, and even five hundred rupees would be asked for a pair of bullocks to be obtained subsequently for a hundred to a hundred and fifty. An easy-going *Sarni* camel would be valued at two to three hundred rupees, and common baggage animals from sixty to a hundred rupees. This is fully twenty per cent. dearer than the same animals could have been purchased for a few years ago. The greater number of the camels came from Jeysulmir and Bikanir, where they are bred in immense numbers. They cost little or nothing to their owners for keep, and if eight or ten are disposed of, the master of the herd goes on his way rejoicing. He has sufficient money to satisfy his simple wants for a year, and takes home the remainder of his stock willingly.

A native will let out his beasts of burden to natives for half what he will let them for to Europeans, not because he fears he will not be paid, not because he fears maltreatment, as some will say, but simply because European baggage consists of hard, heavy, angular boxes, difficult to pack, and much more likely to gall the beasts of burden, where carts cannot be used, than the softer and bulkier bundles of the natives.

In the parts of the fair devoted to merchandise, camel-hair ropes, camel-hair clothes of rough texture, coarse cloth, woollen and cotton, of native manufacture, and English calicoes, were chiefly exposed for sale. Finer descriptions were procurable, we were told, but they were not exposed. Of grain there was little sold except what was necessary for the wants of the fair. Grass was in great demand, and we were told is conveyed from districts miles away, very little growing in the neighbourhood of Pokur. Guns, pistols, rifles, revolvers, powder, lead, shot, saddles for camels and horses, looking-glasses, hunting-knives, and telescopes were largely sold, and seemed to be in great demand.

The religious and commercial parts of the *mela* are quite distinct, and totally different both from the pleasure part of it. The sweetmeat sellers drove a roaring trade. Whatever his rank or profession the native is fond of sweetmeats. Hundreds of dusky children might be seen making themselves sick, one would suppose, with lumps of ghee (clarified butter), sugar, flour, and split almonds. Then there were parched dhal, huge piles of chupatties, kabobs, and even soda-water and brandy. The Rajpoots are not abstainers from alcohol, like the Moslems, not even nominally, and many of them think, like other natives of India, that the strength and force apparent to them in soda-water become the property of the drinker. Venders of holy water from the Ganges too were there, emissaries from the various temples, touting for their various shrines, like the touters for the hotels at an Italian railway station. Beggars, lame, halt, blind, and robust, were there to add to the din, and thrice holy men with mud in their hair and on their bodies, with nails uncut, and full of the odour of sanctity, and filth, and nakedness.

Most of the visitors in the early morning passed to the bathing-place, and yet the lake abounds with crocodiles. Accidents are not numerous of course, but they do sometimes occur. A few years ago a young girl was seized by one of these crocodiles whilst immersed in the lake. A European passing at the time with a loaded revolver saw the struggle, fired at the crocodile before he could secure his victim, shot him in both eyes, and thus saved the poor girl from death. The natives were very angry that a sacred *muggur* (crocodile) should have been thus treated, for all the crocodiles in Pokur lake are sacred! They mobbed the European, and would have dealt more severely with him but for fear; so he was dragged to the nearest magistrate, and accused of wantonly violating their religious feelings. The magistrate saw the section in the Penal Code before his eyes under which punishment should be inflicted for wantonly offending the religious feelings of the natives. 'But where is the dead *muggur*?' he asked. Nobody knew. 'I cannot condemn this man,' said he, 'unless I see the dead *muggur*.' As the uncles and the aunts, the parents, cousins, and friends of the deceased had probably already disposed of him, it would not have been easy to produce the dead animal, and on that shallow pretence, by way of subterfuge, the case was dismissed. The natives were satisfied. The magistrate knew their little peculiarities. Great credit is due to the police for the order and regularity generally prevalent at the Pokur fair.

Far away amongst the mountains, at Seepee (or Sipi), there is a religious fair held early in the year. A grassy glade, surrounded by cedar-pines—a magnificent grove of these splendid trees stretching for miles on both sides of the open space—and a pretty wooden temple, ornamented like a Swiss chalet, towards the right, are the most prominent features of Seepee. If it had been situated amongst

the rocky mountains, our American cousins would have called it a park, perhaps Seepee Park, like Este's Park. A murmuring rivulet runs down the glade and adds animation to the scene; deep ravines bound it on the far-off north-east side, where nature is all grandeur and sublimity.

It was on Friday that I visited it. The bridle path leading to it is precipitous; now you are overshadowed by tall trees on either side, and at another time buried in sloping verdant banks, beautiful with wild flowers of every hue. Large waving ferns cover the frowning rocks here, whilst there they project rough and rugged and bare from the mountain's side. The wonder is how, with such roads, the natives contrive to collect together such a variety of animals and goods. Seepee is some marches from Simla, nestled in where the mountains are most grand and inaccessible, and there a holy temple is the object of pilgrimage, and thousands from all the neighbouring country visit it every April.

In every direction the beautiful valley, when our party visited the fair, was full of human beings and inferior animals; the hum of many voices wandered away up the hillsides, and assailed our ears long before we saw anything of the fair itself. They seemed all happy, those many-tongued people; they were dressed in their gala garments of every hue and in every variety of costume. This bright colouring and variety of costume add very much to the picturesque character of the scene when compared with pilgrimages or fairs in Europe. Nowhere in Europe could you see such kaleidoscopic effects, or such a multitude of diversified people, in raiments so different and various. Merry-go-rounds were busy on both sides of the valley, working away as hard as panting humanity could send them round; and such laughter! so ringing and joyous, so light of heart, and reverberating! It did one good to hear that laughter.

Tents, nearly as various as the people's raiment, were to be seen dotted over the level part of the valley, with awnings of all colours and shapes; carpets were spread out under the awnings, with bolsters, cushions, and native chairs, and hangings of cloth appeared everywhere, blue, red, yellow, and white, crimson, scarlet, purple, and pink. All colours were there except black. Long lines of booths and stalls, with toys and sweetmeats, stretched far away into the cedar groves, all teeming with looking-glasses, beads, necklaces and rings, armlets and anklets, brooches, pins and ornaments for the head; whilst the cook-shops sent forth pleasant odours, and the sweetmeat men displayed their wares in tempting luxuriance. Further away, in the groves, horses, mules and asses, camels and elephants, were picketed about in thousands, the grooms and muleteers lying under the trees, sleeping off their fatigue. They were often sheltered by small tarpaulins, the ropes of which are a constant trap to unwary feet. Facing the merry-go-rounds was a high and sloping bank, covered with women all in

their brightest apparel, watching the fun of the fair, and laughing to each other as heartily as those in the swings.

There were Thibetans, too, men and women from Ladak; the women with their peculiar head-dresses, a leathern strap going over the top of the head and hanging down the back, the said strap incrustated with beads and stones of various colours. The hair was usually brought tightly back from the forehead and drawn together into one long plait, hanging down the back, and adorned at the end with three scarlet tassels. The men wore flat caps, which by no means improved their faces, for they are an ugly race, these Ladakis. Those from the Kanacour and Kooloo valleys were much better looking, the women wearing a jaunty little smoking-cap on the side of their head, and all their massive black hair loose. Then there were Sikhs, Afghans, and Pathans, Hindus from Delhi and the North-West Provinces, and Mohammedans from Sind and the Doabs. Even the Bengali Babu had his representatives here, and I have no doubt went away from Seepee much richer for the fair. The hill people mustered, as might be expected, in great numbers, most of them clean-looking and well-dressed for the occasion. Cleanliness is not usually the characteristic of the hill people, but, for the fair, they made themselves *look* clean. Their women wore tight jackets, coming down to the hips, loose-fitting drawers of every hue, a scarf of some bright colour, silk or woollen usually, drawn over the head, and covering the body as far as the knees, with a marvellous display of nose- and ear-rings, and bracelets and anklets, all tinkling merrily as they walked, a costume pleasing in its effect and more picturesque than those usually seen in India. The men dress much in the same style, their jackets adorned with uncouth decorations, sometimes with rich embroidery, but more generally with beads, claws, teeth, and trophies of the chase. In addition they wear caps or turbans. The poorer portion of the hill people substitute dahlias and rhododendrons for the metal ornaments of their more prosperous compatriots, and not without improving on them.

Conjurors, jugglers, snake-charmers, and minstrels abounded, whilst the merry-go-rounds were filled with laughing tremblers, snatching a fearful joy as they dashed through the air. The pavilion in the centre was occupied by a number of well-dressed natives, a couple of silver sticks at the entrance preventing the crowd from intruding. There was no pushing or shoving, none of that rude 'larking' so common in European, and particularly in English, crowds. Nor was there any intoxication caused by alcohol, although I suspect there were other forms of indulgence equally objectionable—opium-smoking, bhang, and ganja, majun and rindi.

Two principal figures were seated in the places of honour, as we entered the pavilion. One was a fat man, mild-looking and dull, with a great gold chain round his neck and an enormous turban on

his head. This was the Rana of Kothie. The country round belonged to him, and had belonged to his ancestors for many generations. The people around were for the most part his subjects. By his side was a spare, cunning-looking, active-eyed man, whose beard had been dyed a deep maroon. The fat man was taciturn. The spare one, Rana of Dhamie, was vivacious and talkative. The latter was one of the neighbouring hill chieftains, at present a guest of his friend of Kothie. Behind and around were the dependents of each, in various conditions of adornment outwardly, but marvellously unpleasant to the nostrils. With the Dhamie Rana were his two sons, intelligent youths of twelve or fourteen years of age. The eldest had a morocco case of which he was evidently very proud. His father encouraged him to show it to our party. There were three of us, Europeans. With shy pride he opened the case, and displayed a silver watch, quite a common-looking specimen of workmanship, which we duly admired. Then with a silent chuckle, that moved his portly frame hugely, and evidently with no little inward satisfaction, the Rana of Kothie took out of his ample girdle a gold watch. There was nothing remarkable about it, but the pride with which it was exhibited was marvellous. His fat face beamed with huge satisfaction as he put his gold watch beside the silver one of the young Dhamie. Then we were persuaded to show our watches, all three of us, and all three had gold watches, whereupon Kothie chuckled more violently than ever, almost audibly, and with many a Burghley-like nod and many a broad grin he drew the attention of the Dhamie people to the fact that his watch was gold, and the sahibs' watches were all three golden also—singular coincidence!

Presently we took our seats, and the Rana's *levée*, which our entrance had temporarily suspended, was continued. Each of his subjects came forward to the tent door, more or less awkwardly, and presented his *nazar* of a rupee. The Kothie man looked affectionately first at the giver and then at the rupee, but he had hardly time to regard the latter with satisfaction before the inexorable prime minister beside him swept it away into a bag prepared for the purpose. Several similar bags, probably of a thousand each, stood by his side. The Rana evidently makes a good thing of the Seepce fair. No wonder he smiled benignantly; no wonder he nodded with Burghley-like gravity and wisdom; no wonder he chuckled so marvellously.

Hookahs were introduced, and we all smoked. Soon after a man came bearing a box of native perfumes. From this he took a phial containing essence of rose, *atr-i-gulab*, and poured some of it into our hands, a few drops into each. The Kothie Rana then began, with much ceremony and imperturbable gravity, to rub down the Dhamie Rana with it, just as if he were rubbing him for the colic. He then offered to rub us down, but we declined this little

attention. The Dhamie man, not to be behind his fat friend in courtesy, began to rub him down in the same fashion. We compromised the matter by having a drop or two sprinkled on our handkerchiefs.

When these tedious ceremonial observances were complete, games were introduced. Bows and arrows were brought forward, the arrows blunted. One of the Rana's attendants armed himself with a bow and some of these arrows, whilst another, with an axe in his hand, described a series of frantic leaps and contortions, brandishing his axe the while with marvellous rapidity. The man with the bow, at a distance of twenty paces or so, sent the arrow flying at the wild gesticulator again and again, but always without effect. Either it flew harmlessly past him, or was arrested by the swift revolving axe. This amusement continued for some time, and seemed mightily to amuse the Ranas and their suites. All the time our ears were tickled by the martial sounds of a band, consisting of various pipes and reeds of antique and venerable form, a kettle-drum, and a trumpet some four feet long. Is it possible that some mail-coach guard migrated to the Himalayas, with his trumpet amongst his baggage?

This fair continues three or four days. Its principal charm is to be found in the beauty of the locality, the strange commingling of races, and the variety of the costumes and customs.

In sailing down the Ganges during the month Katik, our October, one may pass in the course of a single day half a dozen holy fairs, each with a multitude of pilgrims equal to the population of a large city. All of them are rendered picturesque by the tents and equipages of the wealthy, the variety of the animals, and the bright colouring in which the natives delight—those descendants of the ancient Aryans of India, 'in many respects the most wonderful race that ever lived on earth,' as Professor Max Müller calls them. At night all these tents and booths are illuminated, so that the scene is hardly less animated by night than by day, and all without tumult and disorder. Every one of these localities is hallowed by some mythological tradition, and the firmest faith is reposed by the pilgrims in the truth of those traditions. Engrafted for hundreds, nay, thousands of years, in the minds of the people, they have grown up with them articles of faith, strengthened with their strength. 'Your words are good, Sahib, your teaching is excellent,' said some native headmen of villages to a Christian missionary in Oudh, 'but go and preach elsewhere. We do not want it. Our fathers' faith is enough for us. What should we do in *your* heaven? You want us to go there when we die. We had rather be with our fathers who went before us. What should we do in the heaven of the Sahibs?' This is no fanciful picture. These are the very words spoken in Hindustani to an enthusiastic missionary by the simple villagers.

And what could he say in reply? He felt the force of them, although he did not allow them to paralyse his efforts. The religious *melas* are attended by thousands of devotees on the same principle that prompted the villagers' words to the missionary. They were observed by their fathers. Generation after generation has attended them. Hindu, or Moslem, or Christian the rulers may be, but the *melas* are still the same, and, looking back into the vista of vanished centuries, we still see the same crowds, the same devotions, the same amusements, food, clothing, and attendant animals. When Britons were painted savages it was so, and now that Victoria, Queen of England, is Empress of India, it is so still.

W. KNIGHTON.

WEST-END IMPROVEMENTS.

SIR RICHARD CROSS gave notice of a motion for April 5 in the House of Commons for a select committee to inquire into the working of the Artisans' Dwellings Act. As was the case with other matters of importance this session, circumstances stood in the way, the House was counted out that evening, and no discussion will probably arise on the question for some time.

The displacement of the working classes for urban improvements is a subject which is often looked upon with apathy and indifference. The reason of this must be that those who do not feel an interest in it are ignorant of its great importance, and do not consider that a great portion of the demoralisation amongst the lower classes arises from the bad dwellings and the crowded houses in which they so often live. It is evident that Sir Richard Cross, who has the welfare of the labouring classes much at heart, and who brought in the Artisans' Dwellings Act in 1875, is not satisfied with the working of the Act, which has been hampered, it is said, by the difficulty of buying land at a sufficiently low rate to make the building of workmen's houses possible, and by the enormous expense of the machinery of expropriation. The object of his committee would probably be to find out how the first of these difficulties can be met, either by money lent by the Government, or by private enterprise if it were possible to bring about the compulsory sale of land on those portions which are scheduled to the Act and set apart for dwellings of the labouring classes. Under the Artisans' Dwellings Act comparatively small spaces have been improved, as it has power only over insanitary areas; but a great scheme was brought forward in 1877 by the Metropolitan Board of Works, called 'The Metropolitan Street Improvements Act,' which had, as the promoters said, a twofold object: Firstly, the opening out of two main thoroughfares, one north and south, from Tottenham Court Road to Charing Cross, and another west to east, from Piccadilly Circus to Bloomsbury, both streets crossing at a circus on the site of the present Five Dials. The advantage of this new street would be very great in facilitating the traffic of the metropolis, making in the one instance a con-

tinuous street, extending six miles from west to east. But another great object of the Act was to improve a very bad neighbourhood of streets and courts about the Five Dials, at present the haunts of vice and crime, which could not come under the action of the Artisans' Dwellings Act, because the condition of the courts and streets is not insanitary.

In bringing forward this Bill, the Metropolitan Board expressed great impatience to see its scheme carried out; but four years have now passed, and no part of the district scheduled for the new street has been cleared. The reason given for the delay is the 33rd section. This section, they say, prevents their setting to work, and during last winter the Board passed a resolution to apply this session to Parliament for power 'to amend or repeal so much of section 33 of the Metropolitan Street Improvements Act 1877 as prohibits the Board from taking, for the purposes of that Act, fifteen houses or more occupied by persons belonging to the labouring classes, until sufficient accommodation has been provided for them elsewhere on the lands mentioned in that section; to remove or alter the restrictions so imposed, to alter or repeal the two concluding provisions of that section, or parts thereof, and to confer further powers on the Board with respect to such houses; to vary and extinguish rights which would interfere with the objects of the Bill.'

It is for the purpose of calling the attention of members of both Houses of Parliament to this section 33 of Act 40 and 41 Vict. (1877), to which the Metropolitan Board attribute the failure of the scheme, that these pages are written.

Let us therefore inquire first how the clause came to be inserted in the Act, and what object it had in view.

According to the then Standing Order 211 of the House of Lords, the promoters of a Bill intending the disturbance of the working classes were required to make a return of the number of persons to be so disturbed. The order did not oblige the promoters, as in the case of the Artisans' Dwellings Act, to make a return house by house and family by family, but the numbers might be given according to the houses of the scheduled streets. The object of the promoters of such bills would be to return as small a number as possible. When landowners, trade, or leasehold interests are affected, the person or persons so interested can bestir themselves and see if the returns are correct. But when a Bill affects the interests of working people, what can they do? They probably know nothing of the Bill, or of the injury it may do them, and even should they know it, how can they bestir themselves to get this evil averted? Fortunately for the interest of the labouring classes on the line of this West-End Improvement Bill, the numbers set down of displaced persons were so glaringly wrong that an independent census was taken of the scheduled houses, and instead of only 1,753 persons, as stated by the

Metropolitan Board, being disturbed, the number was found to be 6,637. A petition was therefore prepared from the inhabitants of these streets to the House of Commons, praying that provision might be made for the displaced persons. This petition was put into the hands of the member representing the petitioners in Parliament, but unfortunately it was only presented after the second reading of the Bill, too late to be of the slightest use. A second petition was therefore presented from the same persons to the House of Lords, and was placed in the hands of the Marquis of Lansdowne, who did not fail to present it on the order for the second reading of the Bill, and on that occasion a short discussion took place, in which the Bishop of London represented the suffering caused by the reckless demolition of houses when no provision was made for the inhabitants.

Another petition was lodged by an owner of property in the line of the new street, and Mr. Lyulph Stanley appeared before the select committee of the House of Lords as counsel on behalf of the petitioner, who opposed the Bill only for the purpose of obtaining the introduction of a protecting clause for the interest of the working people who were unable to speak for themselves. So outrageously erroneous had been the figures of the Metropolitan Board in their first return to Parliament, as proved by the independent census mentioned above, that they took a new one, bringing their figures from 1,753, as first stated, to 4,233, the difference between this last figure and the 6,637 given by their opponents arising from the fact that they deducted 1,300 who, they said, were artisans and not labourers, and they deducted 1,500 more, because they said that though these 1,500 were within their lines of deviation, they would not be interfered with in making a new street.

Surely, when such inaccuracies are possible, gravely affecting the interest of large numbers, some means should be taken to make mistakes of a like nature impossible for the future. If the machinery used under the Artisans' Dwellings Act were applied in all cases where the labouring classes are to be disturbed, the interests of the working people would be better protected. When a scheme is laid before the Secretary of State for carrying out the Artisans' Dwellings Act, the Home Secretary in his provisional order most carefully recites the actual number of people who were found dwelling in those tenements before they were pulled down. The number of the families is then recited, and it is stated whether they occupy one room, two rooms, or three rooms, and the Secretary of State causes plans to be deposited at the Home Office in which those blocks are set out, and in those places the local authority, the Metropolitan Board of Works, are bound to rebuild tenements distributed into one, two, or three-room tenements. A block plan is set out so that there can be no mistake about it, and that also is deposited at the Home Office.

So careful has been the Secretary of State to watch over the interests of the working classes, that in one case a provision was made for storerooms for costermongers' barrows, and in another case stabling was provided for the donkeys of the costermongers.

The Artisans' Dwellings Act not only provides for the rehousing of the working classes so far as their numbers are concerned, but also insists that they should be rehoused in the same locality. The Metropolitan Board had no such intentions. They proposed in their Bill of 1877 to accommodate the displaced people of the West End in Gray's Inn Road—a good mile from their present dwellings. This extra mile represents an hour a day in time lost, to say nothing of the fatigue. These unskilled labourers get 4*d.* or 5*d.* an hour, and 5*d.* an hour per day is 2*s.* 6*d.* a week, a tax that would be put on the workmen by removing them to a distance. But even more injurious to them than this tax is the fact that the home is in this way broken up. As one of the witnesses brought forward by Mr. Stanley said, it is sending a man to get his dinner in a public house instead of having it at home, and it is not merely the sum of eightpence or sixpence which he would have to pay for his dinner, which would, had he dined at home, have paid for the food of the whole family if his wife had bought and cooked it, but the man gets into the habit of going to the public house, where he must drink for the good of the house as well as eat, and so the respectability is broken up, one of the chief securities for the improvement of the working classes.

The Metropolitan Board said, in support of their proposal of placing the people a mile further east, that it was immaterial where they lived, as they were well known to be migratory. But with regard to the migratory nature of the working classes it was shown in evidence that they often remain weekly tenants in one house for ten or twenty years, and in some cases have been known to occupy the same room as weekly tenants for forty or fifty years.

Their employment obliges them to remain stationary. The fashionable shops of Regent Street, Bond Street, and St. James's do not move, and they require their workmen near at hand. The numerous coach factories are still about Long Acre. The large warehouses of Crosse & Blackwell in Soho Square, where over 1,000 hands are employed—men, women, boys, and girls—are supplied from the neighbouring streets. Covent Garden, with all its dependents of costermongers and labourers, who have to begin work at four in the morning, is still flourishing, and therefore these working people now living on the West-End line of improvement must continue to live there, or in many cases they would be thrown out of employment, to their great loss.

In answer to the plea brought forward by the Board that Gray's Inn Road, being only a mile from the scheduled part, was not too far for the working classes to be removed from their work, it was shown

in evidence, that it was impossible for those employed by the West-End shops, either as tailors or shoemakers, to live more than a mile off, as their work has to be fetched sometimes two or three times a day, thus causing employers to refuse work to those living beyond a short distance from their shops. Another very important point brought forward in evidence was this, that it is not only the father who works, but also the children, sons and daughters, are wage-earning, and in London, at least at the West End, unlike the northern manufacturing towns, it is usual for families to keep together, and for the sons and daughters not to leave the home, though it may consist of only two or three rooms, until they marry and make a home for themselves; a custom which conduces much to the morality of the girls who work at trades or in factories, as by living at home they remain under the protection and care of their parents.

In former Bills the accommodation of the working classes had been thought of in these words, that when fifteen houses or more are removed, accommodation must be found for those occupying them at the time of the clearance; but it was easy in various ways to evade this order, and to cast off the burden of providing equivalent habitations to those that were demolished. It follows, therefore, that the last part of clause 33 is the most important of all. It runs thus:—

Provided always, that before the Board shall, without the consent of one of Her Majesty's principal Secretaries of State, take for the purpose of this Act fifteen houses or more occupied at the time of the passing of this Act either wholly or partially by persons belonging to the labouring classes as tenants or lodgers, the Board shall prove to the satisfaction of such Secretary of State, that sufficient accommodation in suitable dwellings has been provided elsewhere upon the before-mentioned lands coloured blue, or upon such other lands as may be approved by such Secretary of State, for the same number of persons, having regard to the numbers set forth in the schedule to this Act and to the details relating thereto proved before the said committee and deposited at the Home Office. Provided further, that one of Her Majesty's principal Secretaries of State may, if he think fit, after or even before the Board has acquired any of the said lands so coloured blue, release the Board from the obligations imposed upon them by this enactment with respect to such lands or any part thereof, provided the Board substitute in lieu thereof other lands equally available for the purposes described in this enactment.

The words in the above passage, 'occupied at the time of the passing of this Act,' are those which make this clause so efficient. The number of the labouring classes is calculated at the normal amount before the operations of the promoters have begun to disperse them. A record is kept of these numbers at the Home Office, and of the house-to-house schedules taken in compliance with the Standing Orders, and, in the case of the Act of 1877, is initialled by the chairman of the select committee. There is no trouble in ascertaining these numbers, it is merely a matter of reference.

This is now the clause objected to by the Metropolitan Board

as one impossible to work. They say that the displacement of 4,200 persons is a mere temporary inconvenience, which should gladly be put up with by them for the sake of the improvement of the metropolis.

We can hardly expect the working classes to consider it a privilege to be disturbed, because the ratepayers of London wish for some great improvement for their own benefit. If they wish for a great street, so as to go more rapidly from one end of London to the other, equal justice should be done to the respectable working classes as is done by the Artisans' Dwelling Act in the case of houses of a low description which are often the dens of vice and crime; and if Parliament says in the one case you must take a census of the people before you disturb them, and you must rehouse them on land immediately adjoining, the same strict order should be made and carried out on all urban improvements.

For this object it is greatly to be desired that the Standing Orders of Parliament should be amended, so as to render the insertion of proper clauses compulsory in every case by a self-working machinery, instead of leaving the protection of the working classes to the varying views of different committees and the accidents of parliamentary contests.

The Metropolitan Board say that it would be impossible for them to recoup themselves sufficiently for the expense they will be put to in buying up the existing houses if they have to replace the working classes on the same locality; but let me use Mr. Stanley's words, taken from his speech before the Committee of the House of Lords on their Bill upon this point:—

I do trust that before this Bill leaves your Lordships' Committee, you will take care that such improvements are marked upon the map, and such obligations put upon the promoters, as that all these labouring people shall be rehoused where their work and livelihood is, and that they shall not be driven out in the wide world in order that the Metropolitan Board of Works may recoup themselves a little for the cost of the improvement. But after all, what is the case? You have been told that the difference of cost for the whole of London, between taking the sites for artisans' dwellings and the general mercantile value of the land, is about 60,000*l.*; that is a mere fraction of the cost upon the whole expenditure in London. They are going for a net expenditure, after all recoupment, of close upon three millions of money—two and three-quarter millions at any rate; and they are going to spend this immense sum, which will be spread over sixty years—for they borrow for an immense period—and for the sake of saving 60,000*l.*, and it would not be 60,000*l.*, it would be 50,000*l.*; but supposing that was the extra cost, what is it for housing persons who are not wholly in the West-End Improvement? Sir Sydney Waterlow has given you evidence—and no man knows better about these things than he does—that so great is the increased value of those industrial dwellings, that in the Goswell Road their increased value, compared with what they superseded, is threefold. No doubt, though it might be possible if their sanguine expectations are realised, that they might not get so much on this West-End Improvement in buildings such as were shown to you with shops below, as they would for other shops with everything above at their free disposal, I cannot sup-

pose it would add 50,000*l.* to the whole of the cost of the scheme if they were to rehouse the whole of the people of London involved in their scheme. What is 50,000*l.* to be borrowed by the Metropolitan Board of Works as a charge upon the rates for sixty years? Why it would come to about 4*l.* 5*s.* per cent., and if it was 5 per cent. it would not be 2,500*l.* a year to the ratepayers of London; and for the sake of saving that, will you say that this intense suffering shall be caused to these poor people?

There is very often an outcry raised against the tyranny of the landowner who, to make a deer forest or to enlarge a park, will turn out the labourer and destroy the shepherd's cot. If this is unjust, how much more flagrant is the injustice when we count the sufferers by hundreds and thousands instead of by units. Because the tyrant is a many-headed monster in the shape of a Board, instead of the one self-seeking landlord, the evil is not less and the consequences are more terrible. If one street housing the working classes in this densely populated town is destroyed without adequate provision being made for those who are displaced, the suffering is great, and vice and crime, the result of overcrowding, will increase. One of the highest duties of legislators is to see to the well-being of the labouring people. On their prosperity depend in a great measure the honour and the prosperity of the whole nation, and there is no more certain way of improving the working classes than by giving them the means of living in healthy and decent dwellings.

MAUDE STANLEY.

CARLYLE'S LECTURES ON THE PERIODS OF EUROPEAN CULTURE.

FROM HOMER TO GOETHE.

'DETESTABLE mixture of prophecy and playactorism'—so in his *Reminiscences* Carlyle describes his work as a lecturer. Yet we are assured by a keen, if friendly, critic, Harriet Martineau, that 'the merits of his discourses were so great that he might probably have gone on year after year till this time with improving success and perhaps ease, but the struggle was too severe,' *i.e.* the struggle with nervous excitement and ill-health. In a friendly notice of the first lecture ever delivered (May 1, 1837¹) by Carlyle before a London audience, the *Times* observes: 'The lecturer, who seems new to the mere technicalities of public speaking, exhibited proofs before he had done of many of its higher and nobler attributes, gathering self-possession as he proceeded.'

In the following year a course of twelve lectures was delivered 'On the History of Literature, or the successive Periods of European Culture,' from Homer to Goethe. As far as I can ascertain, except from short sketches of the two lectures of each week in the *Examiner* from May 6, 1838, onwards, it is now impossible to obtain an account of this series of discourses. The writer in the *Examiner* (perhaps Leigh Hunt) in noticing the first two lectures (on Greek literature) writes: 'He again extemporises, he does not read. We doubted on hearing the Monday's lecture whether he would ever attain in this way to the fluency as well as depth for which he ranks among celebrated talkers in private; but Friday's discourse relieved us. He "strode away" like Ulysses himself, and had only to regret, in common with his audience, the limits to which the one hour confined him.' George Ticknor was present at the ninth lecture of this course, and he noted in his diary (June 1, 1838): 'He is a rather small, spare, ugly Scotchman, with a strong accent, which I should think he takes

¹ The 1st of May was illustrious. On the evening of that day Browning's *Stratford* was produced by Macready at Covent Garden Theatre. Dr. Chalmers was at this time also lecturing in London, and extensive reports of his lectures are given in the *Times* and the *Morning Chronicle*.

no pains to mitigate. . . . To-day he spoke—as I think he commonly does—without notes, and therefore as nearly extempore as a man can who prepares himself carefully, as was plain he had done. He was impressive, I think, though such lecturing could not well be very popular; and in some parts, if he were not poetical, he was picturesque.' Ticknor estimates the audience at about one hundred.

A manuscript of over two hundred and fifty pages is in my hands, which I take to be a transcript from a report of these lectures by some skilful writer of shorthand. It gives very fully, and I think faithfully, eleven lectures; one, the ninth, is wanting. In the following pages, I may say, nothing, or very little, is my own. I have transcribed several of the most striking passages of the lectures, and given a view of the whole, preserving continuity by abstracts of those portions which I do not transcribe. In these abstracts I have as far as possible used the words of the manuscript. In a few instances I have found it convenient to bring together paragraphs on the same subject from different lectures. Some passages which say what Carlyle has said elsewhere I give for the sake of the manner, more direct than that of the printed page; sometimes becoming even colloquial. The reader will do well to imagine these passages delivered with that Northern accent which Carlyle's refined Bostonian hearer thought 'he took no pains to mitigate.'

At the outset Carlyle disclaims any intention to construct a scientific theory of the history of culture; some plan is necessary in order to approach the subject and become familiar with it, but any proposed theory must be viewed as one of mere convenience.

There is only one theory which has been most triumphant—that of the planets. (On no other subject has any theory succeeded so far yet. Even that is not perfect; the astronomer knows one or two planets, we may say, but he does not know what they are, where they are going, or whether the solar system is not itself drawn into a larger system of the kind. In short, with every theory the man who knows something about it, knows mainly this—that there is much uncertainty in it, great darkness about it, extending down to an infinite deep; in a word, that he does not know what it is. Let him take a stone, for example, the pebble that is under his feet; he knows that it is a stone broken out of rocks old as the creation, but what that pebble is he knows not; he knows nothing at all about that. This system of making a theory about everything is what we may call an enchanted state of mind. That man should be misled, that he should be deprived of knowing the truth that the world is a reality and not a huge confused hypothesis, that he should be deprived of this by the very faculties given him to understand it, I can call by no other name than Enchantment.

Yet when we look into the scheme of these lectures we perceive a presiding thought, which certainly had more than a provisional value for Carlyle. The history of culture is viewed as a succession of faiths, interrupted by periods of scepticism. The faith of Greece and Rome is succeeded by the Christian faith, with an interval of Pagan scepticism, of which Seneca may be taken as a representative.

The Christian faith, earnestly held to men's hearts during a great epoch, is transforming itself into a new thing, not yet capable of definition, proper to our nineteenth century; of this new thing the Goethe of *Wilhelm Meister* and the *West-östlicher Divan* is the herald. But its advent was preceded by that melancholy interval of Christian scepticism, the eighteenth century, which is represented by Voltaire and the sentimental Goethe of *Werther*, which reached its terrible consummation in the French Revolution; and against which stood out in forlorn heroism Samuel Johnson. Carlyle's general view is a broad one, which disregards all but fundamental differences in human beliefs. The Paganism of Greece is not severed from that of Rome; Christianity, Catholic and Protestant, is essentially of one and the same epoch.

There is a sentence which I find in Goethe full of meaning in this regard. It must be noted, he says, that belief and unbelief are two opposite principles in human nature. The theme of all human history, so far as we are able to perceive it, is the contest between these two principles. All periods, he goes on to say, in which belief predominates, in which it is the main element, the inspiring principle of action, are distinguished by great, soul-stirring, fertile events, and worthy of perpetual remembrance: and, on the other hand, when unbelief gets the upper hand, that age is unfertile, unproductive, and intrinsically mean; in which there is no pabulum for the spirit of man, and no one can get nourishment for himself. This passage is one of the most pregnant utterances ever delivered, and we shall do well to keep it in mind in these disquisitions.

In attempting 'to follow the stream of mind from the period at which the first great spirits of our Western World wrote and flourished down to these times,' we start from Greece. When we ask who were the first inhabitants of Greece, we can derive no clear account from any source. 'We have no good history of Greece. This is not at all remarkable. Greek transactions never had anything alive [for us?]; no result for us; they were dead entirely. The only points which serve to guide us are a few ruined towns, a few masses of stone, and some broken statuary.' Three epochs, however, in Greek history can be traced: the first, that of the siege of Troy—the first confederate act of the Hellenes in their capacity of a European people; the second, that of the Persian invasion; the third, the flower-time of Greece, the period of Alexander the Great, when Greece 'exploded itself on Asia.'

Europe was henceforth to develop herself on an independent footing, and it has been so ordered that Greece was to begin that. As to their peculiar physiognomy among nations, they were in one respect an extremely interesting people, but in another unamiable and weak entirely. It has been somewhere remarked by persons learned in the speculation on what is called the doctrine of races, that the Pelasgi were of Celtic descent. However this may be, it is certain that there is a remarkable similarity in character of the French to these Greeks. Their first feature was what we may call the central feature of all others, *exhausting* (?)² *vehemence*, not

² MS. 'existing.'

exactly *strength*, for there was no permanent coherence in it as in strength, but a sort of fiery impetuosity; a vehemence never anywhere so remarkable as among the Greeks, except among the French, and there are instances of this, both in its good and bad point of view. As to the bad, there is the instance mentioned by Thucydides of the sedition in Corcyra, which really does read like a chapter out of the French Revolution, in which the actors seem to be quite regardless of any moment but that which was at hand.

The story of the massacre is briefly told, which recalls to Carlyle, as it did to Niebuhr, the events of September 1792.

But connected with all this savageness there was an extraordinary delicacy of taste and genius in them. They had a prompt dexterity in seizing the true relations of objects, a beautiful and quick sense in perceiving the places in which the things lay, all round the world, which they had to work with, and this, without being entirely admirable, was in their own internal province highly useful. So the French, with their undeniable barrenness of genius, have yet in a remarkable manner the facility of expressing themselves with precision and elegance, to so singular a degree that no ideas or inventions can possibly become popularised till they are presented to the world by means of the French language. . . . But in poetry, philosophy, and all things the Greek *genius* displays itself with as curious a felicity as the French does in frivolous exercises. Singing or music was the central principle of the Greeks, not a subordinate one. And they were right. What is not musical is rough and hard and cannot be harmonised. Harmony is the essence of Art and Science. The mind moulds to itself the clay, and makes it what it will.

This spirit of harmony is seen even in the earliest Pelasgic architecture, and more admirably in Greek poetry, Greek temples, Greek statuary. A beautiful example may be found in the story of how Phidias achieved his masterpiece at Elis.

When he projected his Jupiter of Elis, his ideas were so confused and bewildered as to give him great unrest, and he wandered about perplexed that the shape he wished would not disclose itself. But one night, after struggling in pain with his thoughts as usual, and meditating on his design, in a dream he saw a group of Grecian maidens approach, with pails of water on their heads, who began a song in praise of Jupiter. At that moment the Sun of Poetry stared upon him, and set free the image which he sought for, and it crystallised, as it were, out of his mind into marble, and became as symmetry itself. This Spirit of Harmony operated directly in him, informing all parts of his mind, thence transferring itself into statuary, seen with the eye, and filling the heart of all people.

Having discussed the origin of Polytheism, Carlyle speaks of divination.

It is really, in my opinion, a blasphemy against human nature to attribute the whole of the system [of polytheism] to quackery and falsehood. Divination, for instance, was the great nucleus round which polytheism formed itself—the constituted core of the whole matter. All people, private men as well as states, used to consult the oracle of Dodona or Delphi (which eventually became the most celebrated of all) on all the concerns of life. Modern travellers have discovered in those places pipes and other secret contrivances from which they have concluded that these oracles were constituted on a principle of falsehood and delusion. Cicero, too, said that he was certain two Augurs could not meet without laughing; and he was likely to know, for he had once been an Augur himself. But I confess that

on reading Herodotus there appears to me to have been very little quackery about it. I can quite readily fancy that there was a great deal of reason in the oracle. The seat of that at Dodona was a deep, dark chasm, into which the diviner entered when he sought the Deity. If he was a man of devout frame of mind, he must surely have then been in the best state of feeling for foreseeing the future, and giving advice to others. No matter how this was carried on—by divination or otherwise—so long as the individual suffered himself to be wrapt in union with a higher being. I like to believe better of Greece than that she was completely at the mercy of fraud and falsehood in these matters.

So it was that Pheidippides, the runner, met Pan in the mountain gorge.³ 'When I consider the frame of mind he must have been in, I have no doubt that he really heard in his own mind that voice of the God of Nature upon the wild mountain side, and that this was not done by quackery or falsehood at all.' But above and around and behind the whole system of polytheism there was a truth discovered by the Greeks—

that truth which is in every man's heart, and to which no thinking man can refuse his assent. They recognised a Destiny! a great, dumb, black power, ruling during time, which knew nobody for its master, and in its decrees was as inflexible as adamant, and every one knew that it was there. It was sometimes called 'Moiræ,' or allotment, part, and sometimes 'the Unchangeable.' Their gods were not always mentioned with reverence. There is a strange document on the point, the Prometheus of Æschylus. Æschylus wrote three plays of Prometheus, but only one has survived. Prometheus had introduced fire into the world, and was punished for that: his design was to make our race a little less wretched than it was. Personally he seems to be a taciturn sort of man, but what he does speak seems like a thunderbolt against Jupiter. . . . Jupiter can hurl him to Tartarus; his time is coming too; he must come down; it is all written in the book of 'Destiny.' This curious document really indicates the primeval qualities of man.

Stories from Herodotus, 'who was a clear-headed, candid man,' of the Scythian nation who shot arrows in the stormy air against their god, and of another people who made war upon the south-wind, similarly illustrate that the ancient reverence for their deities was not the reverence for that which is highest or most powerful in the universe.

From the religion we pass (*Lecture II.*) to the literature of the Greeks. 'The *Iliad* or *Song of Ilion* consists of a series of what I call ballad delineations of the various occurrences which took place then, rather than a narrative of the event itself. For it begins in the middle of it, and, I might say, ends in the middle of it.' The only argument in favour of Homer being the real author is derived from the common opinion and from the unity of the poem.

There ^{appears} appears to me to be a great improbability that any one would compose an epic except in writing. . . . I began myself some time ago to read the *Iliad*, which I had not looked at since I left school, and I must confess that from reading

³ Carlyle tells the story of Pheidippides evidently from memory, and not quite accurately.

alone I became completely convinced that it was not the work of one man. . . . As to its unity—its value does not consist in an excellent sustaining of characters. There is not at all the sort of style in which Shakespeare draws his characters; there is simply the cunning man, the great-headed, coarse, stupid man, the proud man; but there is nothing so remarkable but that any one else could have drawn the same characters for the purpose of piecing them into the *Iliad*. We all know the old Italian comedy, their harlequin, doctor, and columbine. There are almost similar things in the characters in the *Iliad*.

In fact the *Iliad* has such unity—not more and not less—as the modern collection of our old Robin Hood ballads.

Contrasting the melodious Greek mind with the not very melodious English mind, the citlura with the fiddle (between which, by the way, there is strong resemblance), and having in remembrance that those of the one class were sung in alehouses, while the other were sung in kings' palaces, it really appears that Robin Hood's ballads have received the very same arrangement as that which in other times produced 'the Tale of Troy divine.'

The poetry of Homer possesses the highest qualities because it delineates what is ancient and simple, the impressions of a primeval mind. Further,

Homer does not seem to believe his story to be a fiction; he has no doubt it is a truth. . . . I do not mean to say that Homer could have sworn to the truth of his poems before a jury—far from it—but that he repeated what had survived in tradition and records, and expected his readers to believe them as he did.

With respect to the 'machinery,' gods and goddesses, Homer was not decorating his poem with pretty fictions. Any remarkable man then might be regarded as supernatural; the experience of the Greeks was narrow, and men's hearts were open to the marvellous.

Thus Pindar mentions that Neptune appeared on one occasion at the Nemean⁴ games. Here it is conceivable that if some aged individual of venerable mien and few words had in fact come thither his appearance would have attracted attention; people would have come to gaze upon him, and conjecture have been busy. It would be natural that a succeeding generation should actually report that a god appeared upon the earth.

In addition to these excellences,

the poem of the *Iliad* was actually intended to be sung; it sings itself, not only the cadence, but the whole thought of the poem sings itself as it were; there is a serious recitative in the whole matter. . . . With these two qualities, Music and Belief, he places his mind in a most beautiful brotherhood, in a sincere contact with his own characters; there are no reticences; he allows himself to expand with some touching loveliness, and occasionally it may be with an awkwardness that carries its own apology, upon all the matters that come in view of the subject of his work.

In the *Odyssey* there is more of character, more of unity, and it represents a higher state of civilisation. Pallas, who had been a warrior, now becomes the Goddess of Wisdom. Ulysses, in the *Iliad* 'an adroit, shifting, cunning man,' becomes now 'of a tragic signifi-

⁴ Isthmian? See Pindar, *Olymp.* viii. 64.

cance.' He is now 'the *much-enduring*, a most endearing of epithets.' It is impossible that the *Odyssey* could have been written by many different people.

As to detailed beauties of Homer's poetry, we have a touching instance in Agamemnon's calling not only on gods but rivers and stars to witness his oath; 'he does not say what they *are*, but he feels that he himself is a mysterious existence, standing by the side of them, mysterious existences.' Sometimes the simplicity of Homer's similes make us smile; 'but there is great kindness and veneration in the smile.' There is a beautiful formula which he uses to describe death:—

'He thumped down falling, and his arms jingled about him.' Now trivial as this expression may at first appear, it does convey a deep insight and feeling of that phenomenon. The fall, as it were, of a sack of clay, and the jingle of armour, the last sound he was ever to make throughout time, who a minute or two before was alive and vigorous, and now falls a heavy dead mass. . . . But we must quit Homer. There is one thing, however, which I ought to mention about Ulysses, that he is the very model of the type Greek, a perfect image of the Greek genius; a shifty, nimble, active, man, involved in difficulties, but every now and then bobbing up out of darkness and confusion, victorious and intact.

Passing by the early Greek philosophers, whose most valuable contribution to knowledge was in the province of geometry, Carlyle comes to Herodotus.

His work is, properly speaking, an encyclopædia of the various nations, and it displays in a striking manner the innate spirit of harmony that was in the Greeks. It begins with Cræsus, King of Lydia; upon some hint or other it suddenly goes off into a digression on the Persians, and then, apropos of something else, we have a disquisition on the Egyptians, and so on. At first we feel somewhat impatient of being thus carried away at the sweet will of the author; but we soon find it to be the result of an instinctive spirit of harmony, and we see all these various branches of the tale come pouring down at last in the invasion of Greece by the Persians. It is that spirit of order which has constituted him the prose poet of his country. . . . It is mainly through him that we become acquainted with Themistocles, that model of the type Greek in prose, as Ulysses was in song. . . .

Contemporary with Themistocles, and a little prior to Herodotus, Greek tragedy began. Æschylus I define to have been a *truly gigantic man*—one of the largest characters ever known, and all whose movements are clumsy and huge like those of a son of Anak. In short, his character is just that of Prometheus himself as he has described him. I know no more pleasant thing than to study Æschylus; you fancy you hear the old dumb rocks speaking to you of all things they had been thinking of since the world began, in their wild, savage utterances.

Sophocles translated the drama into a choral peal of melody. 'The *Antigone* is the finest thing of the kind ever sketched by man.' Euripides writes for effect's sake, 'but how touching is the effect produced!'

Socrates, as viewed by Carlyle, is 'the emblem of the decline of the Greeks,' when literature was becoming speculative.

I willingly admit that he was a man of deep feeling and morality; but I can well understand the idea which Aristophanes had of him, that he was a man going

to destroy all Greece with his innovation. . . . He shows a lingering kind of awe and attachment for the old religion of his country, and often we cannot make out whether he believed in it or not. He must have had but a painful intellectual life, a painful kind of life altogether one would think. . . . He devoted himself to the teaching of morality and virtue, and he spent his life in that kind of mission. I cannot say that there was any evil in this; but it does seem to me to have been of a character entirely unprofitable. I have a great desire to admire Socrates, but I confess that his writings seem to be made up of a number of very wire-drawn notions about virtue; there is no conclusion in him; there is no word of life in Socrates. He was, however, personally a coherent and firm man.

We pass now (*Lecture III.*) to the Romans.

We may say of this nation that as the Greeks may be compared to the *children* of antiquity from their *naïveté* and gracefulness, while their whole history is an aurora, the dawn of a higher culture and civilisation, so the Romans were the *men* of antiquity, and their history a glorious, warm, laborious day, less beautiful and graceful no doubt than the Greeks, but more essentially useful. . . . The Greek life was shattered to pieces against the harder, stronger life of the Romans. . . . It was just as a beautiful crystal jar becomes dashed to pieces upon the hard rocks, so inexpressible was the force of the strong Roman energy.⁵

The Romans show the characters of two distinct species of people—the Pelasgi and the Etruscans. The old Etruscans, besides possessing a certain genius for art, were an agricultural people—

endowed with a sort of sullen energy, and with a spirit of intensely industrious thrift, a kind of vigorous thrift. Thus with respect to the ploughing of the earth they declare it to be a kind of blasphemy against nature to leave a clod unbroken. . . . Now this feeling was the fundamental characteristic of the Roman people before they were distinguished as conquerors. Thrift is a quality held in no esteem, and is generally regarded as mean; it is certainly mean enough, and objectionable from its interfering with all manner of intercourse between man and man. But I can say that thrift well understood includes in itself the best virtues that a man can have in the world; it teaches him self-denial, to postpone the present to the future, to calculate his means, and regulate his actions accordingly; thus understood, it includes all that man can do in his vocation. Even in its worst state it indicates a great people.⁶

Joined with this thrift there was in the Romans a great seriousness and devoutness; and they made the Pagan notion of fate much more productive of consequences than the Greeks did, by their conviction that Rome was fated to rule the world. And it was good for the world to be ruled sternly and strenuously by Rome: it is the true liberty to obey.

That stubborn grinding down of the globe which their ancestors practised, ploughing the ground fifteen times to make it produce a better crop than if it were ploughed fourteen times, the same was afterwards carried out by the Romans in all the concerns of their ordinary life, and by it they raised themselves above all other people. Method was their principle just as harmony was of the Greeks.

⁵ Here Carlyle speaks of Niebuhr, whose book 'is altogether a laborious thing, but he affords after all very little light on the early period of Roman history.'

⁶ See, to the same effect, 'a certain editor' in *Frederick the Great*, b. iv. chap. 4.

The method of the Romans was a sort of harmony, but not that beautiful graceful thing which was the Greek harmony. Theirs was a harmony of plans, an architectural harmony, which was displayed in the arranging of practical antecedents and consequences.

The 'crowning phenomenon' of their history was the struggle with Carthage. The Carthaginians were like the Jews, a stiff-necked people; a people proverbial for injustice.

I most sincerely rejoice that they did not subdue the Romans, but that the Romans got the better of them. We have indications which show that they were a mean people compared to the Romans, who thought of nothing but commerce, would do anything for money, and were exceedingly cruel in their measures of aggrandisement and in all their measures. . . . How the Romans got on after that we can see by the Commentaries which Julius Cæsar has left us of his own proceedings; how he spent ten years of campaigns in Gaul, cautiously planning all his measures before he attempted to carry them into effect. It is, indeed, a most interesting book, and evinces the indomitable force of Roman energy; the triumph of civil, methodic man over wild and barbarous man.

Before Cæsar the government of Rome seems to have been a

very tumultuous kind of polity, a continual struggle between the Patricians and the Plebeians. . . . Therefore I cannot join in the lamentations made by some over the downfall of the Republic, when Cæsar took hold of it. It had been but a constant struggling scramble for prey, and it was well to end it, and to see the wisest, cleanest, and most judicious man of their place himself at the top of it. . . . And what an Empire was it! Teaching mankind that they should be tilling the ground, as they ought to be, instead of fighting one another. For that is the real thing which every man is called on to do—to till the ground, and not to slay his poor brother-man.

Coming now to their language and literature—the peculiarly distinguishing character of the language is 'its imperative sound and structure, finely adapted to command.' Their greatest work was written on the face of the planet in which we live; and all their great works were done spontaneously through a deep instinct.

The point is not to be able to write a book; the point is to have *the true mind for it*. Everything in that case which a nation does will be equally significant of its mind. If any great man among the Romans, Julius Cæsar or Cato for example, had never done anything but till the ground, they would have acquired equal excellence in that way. They would have ploughed as they conquered. Everything a great man does carries the traces of a great man.

Virgil's *Æneid*

ranks as an epic poem, and one, too, of the same sort in name as the *Iliad* of Homer. But I think it entirely a different poem, and very inferior to Homer. There is that fatal consciousness, that knowledge that he is writing an epic. The plot, the style, all is vitiated by that one fault. The characters, too, are none of them to be compared to the healthy, whole-hearted, robust men of Homer, the much-enduring Ulysses, or Achilles, or Agamemnon. *Æneas*, the hero of the poem, is a lachrymose sort of man altogether. He is introduced in the middle of a storm, but instead of handling the tackle and doing what he can for the ship, he sits still, groaning over his misfortunes. 'Was ever mortal,' he asks, 'so unfor-

fortunate as I am? Chased from port to port by the persecuting deities, who give me no respite,' and so on; and then he tells them how he is 'the pious Æneas.' In short, he is just that sort of lachrymose man; there is hardly anything of a man in the inside of him.

'When he let himself alone,' Virgil was a great poet, admirable in his description of natural scenery, and in his women; an amiable man of mild deportment, called by the people of Naples 'the maid.' 'The effect of his poetry is like that of some laborious mosaic of many years in putting together. There is also the Roman method, the Roman amplitude and regularity.' His friend Horace is 'sometimes not at all edifying in his sentiments;' too Epicurean; 'he displays a worldly kind of sagacity, but it is a great sagacity.' After these, Roman literature quickly degenerated.

If we want an example of a diseased self-consciousness and exaggerated imagination, a mind blown up with all sorts of strange conceits, the spasmodic state of intellect, in short, of a man morally unable to speak the truth on any subject—we have it in Seneca. . . . I willingly admit that he had a strong desire to be sincere, and that he endeavoured to convince himself that he was right, but even this when in connection with the rest constitutes of itself a fault of a dangerous kind.

But—such is the power of genius to make itself heard at all times—the most significant and the greatest of Roman writers appeared later than Seneca.

In the middle of all that quackery and puffery coming into play turn about in every department, when critics wrote books to teach you how to hold your arm and your leg, in the middle of all this absurd and wicked period Tacitus was born, and was enabled to be a Roman after all. He stood like a Colossus at the edge of a dark night, and he sees events of all kinds hurrying past him, and plunging he knew not where, but evidently to no good, for falsehood and cowardice never yet ended anywhere but in destruction.

Yet he writes with grave calmness, he does not seem startled, he is convinced that it will end well somehow or other, 'for he has no belief but the old Roman belief, full of their old feelings of goodness and honesty.' Carlyle closes his view of pagan literature with that passage in which Tacitus speaks of the origin of the sect called Christians.

It was given to Tacitus to see deeper into the matter than appears from the above account of it. But he and the great Empire were soon to pass away for ever; and it was this despised sect—this *Christus quidam*—it was in this new character that all the future world lay hid.

The transition period (*Lecture IV.*), styled 'the millennium of darkness,' was really a great and fertile period, during which belief was conquering unbelief; conquering it not by force of argument but through the heart, and 'by the conviction of men who spoke into convincing minds.' Belief—that is the great fact of the time. The last belief left by Paganism is seen in the Stoic philosophers—belief

in oneself, belief in the high, royal nature of man. But in their opinions a great truth is extremely exaggerated :—

That bold assertion for example, in the face of all reason and fact, that pain and pleasure are the same thing, that man is indifferent to both. . . . If we look into the Christian religion, that dignification of man's life and nature, we shall find indeed this also in it,—to believe in oneself. . . . But then how unspeakably more human is *this* belief, not held in proud scorn and contempt of other men, in cynical disdain or indignation at their paltriness, but received by exterminating pride altogether from the mind, and held in degradation and deep human sufferings.

Christianity reveals the divinity of human sorrow.

In another point of view we may regard it as the revelation of Eternity: Every man may with truth say that he waited for a whole eternity to be born, and that he has a whole Eternity waiting to see what he will do now that he is born. It is this which gives to this little period of life, so contemptible when weighed against eternity, a significance it never had without it. It is thus an infinite arena, where infinite issues are played out. Not an action of man but will have its truth realised and will go on for ever. . . . This truth, whatever may be the opinions we hold on Christian doctrine, or whether we hold upon them a sacred silence or not, we must recognise in Christianity and its belief independent of all theories.

If to the character of the new faith we add the character of the Northern people, we have the two leading phenomena of the Middle Ages. With much shrewdness, the still rude societies of Europe find their way to order and quiet. Then, there was that thing which we call *loyalty*. In these times of our own

loyalty is much kept out of sight, and little appreciated, and many minds regard it as a sort of obsolete chimera, looking more to independence and some such thing, now regarded as a great virtue. And this is very just, and most suitable to this time of movement and progress. It must be granted at once that to exact loyalty to things so bad as to be not worth being loyal to is quite an unsupportable thing, and one that the world would spurn at once. This must be conceded; yet the better thinkers will see that *loyalty* is a principle perennial in human nature, the highest that unfolds itself there in a temporal, secular point of view. In the Middle Ages it was the noblest phenomenon, the finest phasis in society anywhere. Loyalty was the foundation of the State.

Another cardinal point was the Church. 'Like all other matters, there were contradictions and inconsistencies without end, but it should be regarded in its Ideal.' Hildebrand represents the Mediæval Church at its highest power. 'He has been regarded by some classes of Protestants as the wickedest of men, but I do hope we have at this time outgrown all that. He perceived that the Church was the highest thing in the world, and he resolved that it should be at the top of the whole world, animating human things, and giving them their main guidance.' Having described the humiliation of the Emperor Henry the Fourth at the Castle of Canossa, Carlyle proceeds :—

One would think from all this that Hildebrand was a proud man, but he was not a proud man at all, and seems from many circumstances to have been on the contrary a man of very great humility; but here he treated himself as the repre-

sentative of Christ, and far beyond all earthly authorities. In these circumstances doubtless there are many questionable things, but then there are many cheering things. For we see the son of a poor Tuscan peasant, solely by the superior spiritual love that was in him, humble a great emperor, at the head of the iron force of Europe, and, to look at it in a tolerant point of view, it is really very grand; it is the spirit of Europe set above the body of Europe; the mind triumphant over the brute force. . . . Some have feared that the tendency of such things is to found a theocracy, and have imagined that if this had gone on till our days a most abject superstition would have become established; but this is entirely a vain theory. The clay that is about man is always sufficiently ready to assert its rights; the danger is always the other way, that the spiritual part of man will become overlaid with his bodily part. This then was the Church, which with the loyalty of the time were the two hinges of society, and that society was in consequence distinguished from all societies which have preceded it, presenting an infinitely greater diversity of views, a better humanity, a largeness of capacity. This society has since undergone many changes, but I hope that *that* spirit may go on for countless ages, the spirit which at that period was set going.

The grand apex of that life was the Crusades.

One sees Peter [the Hermit] riding along, dressed in his brown cloak, with the rope of the penitent tied round him, carrying all hearts, and burning them up with zeal, and stirring up steel-clad Europe till it shook itself at the words of Peter. What a contrast to the greatest of orators, Demosthenes, spending nights and years in the construction of those balanced sentences which are still read with admiration, descending into the smallest details, speaking with pebbles in his mouth and the waves of the sea beside him, and all his way of life in this manner occupied during many years, and then to end in simply nothing at all; for he did nothing for his country, with all his eloquence. And then see this poor monk start here without any art; for as Demosthenes was once asked what was the secret of a fine orator, and he replied Action, Action, Action, so, if I were asked it, I should say Belief, Belief, Belief. . . . Some have admired the Crusades because they served to bring all Europe into communication with itself, others because it produced the elevation of the middle classes; but I say that the great result which characterises and gives them all their merits, is that in them Europe for one moment proved its belief, proved that it believed in the invisible world, which surrounds the outward and visible world, that this belief had for once entered into the consciousness of man.

It was not an age for literature. The noble made his signature by dipping the glove-mailed hand into the ink and imprinting it on the charter. But heroic lives were lived, if heroic poems were not written; an ideal did exist; the heroic heart was not then desolate and alone; the great result of the time was 'a perpetual struggling forward.' And a literature did come at last; beautiful childlike utterances of troubadour and trouvère; lasting, however, but a little while, in consequence of the rise of a kind of feeling adverse to the spirit of harmony. Petrarch, the troubadour of Italy, and the Nibelungenlied represent the period. The spirit of the age did not speak much, but it was not lost. 'It is not so ordered.' When we hear rude, natural voices singing in the distance, all is true and bright, because all false notes destroy one another, and are absorbed in the air before they reach us, and only the true notes come to us. So in the Middle Ages we only get the heroic essence of the whole.

Of the new-formed nations the Italian 'first possesses a claim on our solicitude.' (*Lecture V.*)⁷ Though Italy was not a great political power, she produced a greater number of great men distinguished in art, thinking, and conduct than any other country—and to produce great men is the highest thing any land can do. The spokesman of Italy in literature is Dante—one who stands beside Æschylus and Shakespeare, and 'we really cannot add another great name to these.' The idea of his *Divina Commedia*, with its three kingdoms of eternity, is 'the greatest idea that we have ever got at.' 'I think that when all records of Catholicism have passed away, when the Vatican shall be crumbled into dust, and St. Peter's and Strasburg minster be no more, for thousands of years to come Catholicism will survive in this sublime relic of antiquity.' Dante is great in his wrath, his scorn, his pity; great above all in his sorrow. His greatness of heart, united with his greatness of intellect, determine his character; and his poem sings itself, has both insight and song. Dante does not seem to know that he is doing anything very remarkable, differing herein from Milton.

In all his delineations he has a most beautiful, sharp grace, the quickest and clearest intellect; it is just that honesty with which his mind was set upon his subject that carries it out. . . . Take for example his description of the city of Dis to which Virgil carries him; it possesses a beautiful simplicity and honesty. The light was so dim that people could hardly see, and they winked at him, just as people wink with their eyes under the new moon, or as an old tailor winks threading his needle when his eyes are not good.

The passage about Francesca is 'as tender as the voice of mothers, full of the gentlest pity, though there is much stern tragedy in it. . . . The whole is beautiful, like a clear piping voice heard in the middle of a whirlwind; it is so sweet, and gentle, and good.' The *Divine Comedy* is not a satire on Dante's enemies.

It was written in the pure spirit of justice. Thus he pitied poor Francesca, and would not have willingly placed her in that torment, but it was the justice of God's law that doomed her there. . . . Sudden and abrupt movements are frequent in Dante. He is indeed full of what I can call military movements. . . . Those passages are very striking where he alludes to his own sad fortunes; there is in them a wild sorrow, a savage tone of truth, a breaking heart, the hatred of Florence, and with it the love of Florence. . . . His old schoolmaster tells him 'If thou follow thy star thou canst not miss a happy harbour.' That was just it. That star occasionally shone on him from the blue, eternal depths, and he felt he was doing something good; he soon lost it again; lost it again as he fell back into the trough of the sea. . . . Bitter! bitter! poor exile,—none but scoundrelly persons to associate with. . . . The *Inferno* has become of late times mainly the favourite of the three [parts of the poem]; it has harmonised well with the taste of the last thirty or forty years, in which Europe has seemed to covet more a violence of emotion and a strength of convulsion than almost any other quality. . . . but I question whether the *Purgatorio* is not better, and a greater thing. . . .

⁷ I make few excerpts from this lecture, for a good part of its substance appears in the lecture 'The Hero as Poet,' in *Heroes and Hero-worship*.

Men have of course ceased to believe these things, that there is the mountain rising up in the ocean there, or that there are those Malebolgic black gulfs ; but still men of any knowledge at all must believe that there exists the inexorable justice of God, and that penitence is a great thing here for man ; for life is but a series of errors made good again by repentance, and the sacredness of that doctrine is asserted in Dante in a manner more moral than anywhere else. . . . One can well understand what the Germans say of the three parts of the *Divina Commedia*, viz. that the first is the architectural, plastic part, as of statuary ; the second is the pictorial or picturesque ; the third is the musical, the melting into music, song.

Lecture VI.—Dante's way of thinking, in the nature of things, could not long continue. With an increased horizon of knowledge, his theory could no longer fit. 'All theories approximate more or less to the great theory which remains itself always unknown. . . . Every philosophy that exists is destined to be embraced, melted down as it were into some larger philosophy.' Universities, the art of printing, gunpowder, were changing the aspects of human life during the two centuries that lie between Dante and Cervantes. Loyalty and the Catholic religion, as we saw, gave their character to the Middle Ages. Chivalry, the great product of the Spanish nation, is a practical illustration of loyalty ; and chivalry includes, with the German valour of character, another German feature, the reverence for women. The Spanish nation was fitted to carry chivalry to a higher perfection than it attained anywhere else.

The Spaniards had less breadth of genius than the Italians, but they had, on the other hand, a lofty, sustained enthusiasm in a higher degree than the Italians, with a tinge of what we call romance, a dash of oriental exaggeration, and a tenacious vigour in prosecuting their object ; of less depth than the Germans, of less of that composed silent force ; yet a great people, calculated to be distinguished.

Its early heroes, Viriathus and the Cid (whose memory is still musical among the people), lived silent ; their works spoke for them. The first great Spanish name in literature is that of Cervantes. His life—that of a man of action—is told by Carlyle in his brief, picturesque manner. *Don Quixote* is the very reverse of Dante, yet has analogies with Dante. It was begun as a satire on chivalry, a burlesque ; but as Cervantes proceeds, the spirit grows on him.

In his *Don Quixote* he portrays his own character, representing himself, with good natural irony, mistaking the illusions of his own heart for realities. But he proceeds ever more and more harmoniously. . . . Above all, we see the good-humoured cheerfulness of the author in the middle of his unfortunate destiny ; never provoked with it ; no atrabilious quality ever obtained any mastery in his mind. . . . Independently of chivalry, *Don Quixote* is valuable as a sort of sketch of the perpetual struggle in the human soul. We have the hard facts of this world's existence, and the ideal scheme struggling with these in a high enthusiastic manner delineated there ; and for this there is no more wholesome vehicle anywhere than irony. . . . If he had given us only a high-flown panegyric on the Age of Gold,⁸ he would have found no ear for him ; it is the self-mockery in

⁸ Carlyle had previously made particular reference to the scene with the goat-herds.

which he envelops it, which reconciles us to the high bursts of enthusiasm, and will keep the matter alive in the heart as long as there are men to read it. It is the Poetry of Comedy.

Cervantes possessed in an eminent degree the thing critics call *humour*.

If any one wish to know the difference between humour and wit, the laughter of the fool, which the wise man, by a similitude founded on deep earnestness, calls the crackling of thorns under a pot, let him read Cervantes on the one hand, and on the other Voltaire, the greatest laughter the world ever knew.

Of Calderon Carlyle has not read much, 'in fact only one play and some choice specimens collected in German books,' and in the German admiration for Calderon he suspects there is 'very much of forced taste.' Lope was 'a man of a strange facility, but of much shallowness too, and greatly inferior to Calderon.' In the history of Spanish literature there are only these two beside Cervantes. Why Spain declined cannot be explained: 'we can only say just this, that its time was come.' The lecture closes with a glance at 'that conflict of Catholicism and Chivalry with the Reformation commonly called the Dutch War.'

Lecture VII.—The Reformation places us upon German soil. The German character had a deep earnestness in it, proper to a meditative people. The strange fierceness known as the Berserkir rage is also theirs.

Rage of that sort, defying all dangers and obstacles, if kept down sufficiently, is as a central fire which will make all things to grow on the surface above it. . . . On the whole it is the best character that can belong to any nation, producing strength of all sorts, and all the concomitants of strength—perseverance, steadiness, not easily excited, but when it is called up it will have its object accomplished. We find it in all their history. Justice, that is another of its concomitants; strength, one may say, in justice itself. The strong man is he that can be just, that sets everything in its own rightful place one above the other.

Before the Reformation there had been two great appearances of the Germans in European history—the first in the overthrow of the Empire, the second in the enfranchisement of Switzerland. The Reformation was the inevitable result of human progress, the old theory no longer being found to fit the facts. And 'when the mind begins to be dubious about a creed, it will rush with double fury towards destruction; for all serious men hate dubiety.'

In the sixteenth century there was no Pope Hildebrand ready to sacrifice life itself to the end that he might make the Church the highest thing in the world. The Popes did indeed maintain the Church, 'but they just believed nothing at all, or believed that they got so many thousand crowns a year by it. The whole was one chimaera, one miserable sham.' Any one inclined to see things in their proper light 'would have decided that it was better to have nothing to do with it, but crouch down in an obscure corner somewhere, and read his Bible, and get what good he can for himself in that way,

but have nothing to do with the Machiavellian policy of such a Church.'

At such a time Luther appeared, Luther 'whose life was not to sink into a downy sleep while he heard the great call of a far other life upon him.'⁹ His character presents whatever is best in German minds.

He is the image of a large, substantial, deep man, that stands upon truth, justice, fairness, that fears nothing, considers the right and calculates on nothing else; and again, does not do it spasmodically, but quietly, calmly; no need of any noise about it; adheres to it deliberately, calmly, through good and bad report. Accordingly we find him a good-humoured, jovial, witty man, greatly beloved by every one, and though his words were half battles, as Jean Paul says, stronger than artillery, yet among his friends he was one of the kindest of men. The wild kind of force that was in him appears in the physiognomy of the portrait by Luke Cranach, his painter and friend; the rough plebeian countenance with all sorts of noble thoughts shining out through it. That was precisely Luther as he appears through his whole history.

Erasmus admitted the necessity of some kind of reformation:—

But that he should risk his ease and comfort for it did not enter into his calculations at all. . . . I should say, to make my friends understand the character of Erasmus, that he is more like Addison than any other writer who is familiarly known in this country. . . . He was a man certainly of great merit, nor have I much to say against him . . . but he is not to be named by the side of Luther,—a mere writer of poems, a *littérateur*.

There is a third striking German character whom we must notice, Ulrich Hutten—a straggler all his days;

much too headlong a man. He so hated injustice that he did not know how to deal with it, and he became heart-broken by it at last. . . . He says of himself he hated tumult of all kinds, and it was a painful and sad position for him that wished to obey orders, while a still higher order commanded him to disobey, when the standing by that order would be in fact the standing by disorder.

His lifting his cap, when at the point of death, because he had reverence for what was above him, to the Archbishop who had caused his destruction, 'seems to me the noblest, politest thing that is recorded of any such a moment as that.' And the worst thing one reads of Erasmus is his desertion of Hutten in his day of misfortune.

The English nation (*Lecture VIII.*) first comes into decisive notice about the time of the Reformation. In the English character there is 'a kind of silent ruggedness of nature, with the wild Berserkir rage deeper down in the Saxon than in the others: 'English talent is practical like that of the Romans, a greatness of perseverance, adherence to a purpose, method; practical greatness, in short. In the early history, before Alfred, 'we read of battles and successions of kings, and one endeavours to remember them, but without success, except so much of

⁹ Much of what Carlyle says here of Luther reappears in *Heroes and Hero-worship*.

this flocking and fighting as Milton gives us, viz. that they were the battles of the kites and crows.' Yet the history of England was then in the making. 'Whoever was uprooting a thistle or bramble, or drawing out a bog, or building himself a house, or in short leaving a single section of order where he had found disorder, that man was writing the History of England, the others were only obstructing it.' The battles themselves were a means of ascertaining who among them should rule—who had most force and method among them. A wild kind of intellect as well as courage and traces of deep feeling are scattered over their history. There was an affirmativeness, a largeness of soul, in the intervals of these fights of kites and crows, as the doings of King Alfred show us.

About the time of Queen Elizabeth the confused elements amalgamated into some distinct vital unity. That period was 'in many respects the summation of innumerable influences, the co-ordination of many things which till then had been in contest, the first beautiful outflush of energy, the first articulate, spoken energy.' After centuries the blossom of poetry appeared for once. Shakespeare is the epitome of the age of Elizabeth; he is the spokesman of our nation; like Homer, Æschylus, and Dante, a voice from the innermost heart of nature; a universal man.¹⁰ His intellect was far greater than that of any other that has given an account of himself by writing books. 'There is no tone of feeling that is not capable of yielding melodious resonance to that of Shakespeare.' In him lay 'the great, stern Berserkir rage burning deep down under all, and making all to grow out in the most flourishing way, doing ample justice to all feelings, not developing any one in particular.' What he writes is properly *nature*, 'the instinctive behest of his mind. This all-producing Earth knows not the symmetry of the oak which springs from it. It is all beautiful, not a branch is out of its place, all is symmetry: but the Earth has itself no conception of it, and produced it solely by the virtue that was in itself.' Shakespeare has a beautiful sympathy of brotherhood with his subject, but he seems to have no notion at all of the great and deep things in him. Certain magniloquent passages he seems to have imagined extraordinarily great, but in general there is perfect sincerity in any matter he undertakes. It was by accident that he was roused to be a poet, 'for the greatest man is always a quiet man by nature. We are sure not to find greatness in a prurient, noisy man.'

We turn from Shakespeare to a very different man—John Knox.

Luther would have been a great man in other things beside the Reformation, a great substantial happy man, who must have excelled in whatever matter he undertook. Knox had not that faculty, but simply this of standing upon truth entirely; it isn't that his sincerity is known to him to be sincerity, but it arises

¹⁰ Many things said of Shakespeare and of Knox in this lecture are repeated in *Heroes and Hero-worship*.

from a sense of the impossibility of any other procedure. . . . Sincerity, what is it but a divorce from earth and earthly feelings? The sun which shines upon the earth, and seems to touch it, doesn't touch the earth at all. So the man who is free of earth is the only one that can maintain the great truths of existence, not by an ill-natured talking for ever about truth, but it is he who does the truth. There is a great deal of humour in Knox, as bright a humour as in Chaucer, expressed in his own quaint Scotch. . . . Thus when he describes the two archbishops quarrelling, no doubt he was delighted to see the disgrace it brought on the Church, but he was chiefly excited by the really ludicrous spectacle of rochets flying about, and vestments torn, and the struggle each made to overturn the other.

Milton may be considered 'as a summing up, composed as it were of the two, Shakespeare and Knox.'¹¹ Shakespeare having reverence for everything that bears the mark of the Deity, may well be called religious, but he is of no particular sect. Milton is altogether sectarian. As a poet 'he was not one of those who reach into actual contact with the deep fountain of greatness;' his *Paradise Lost* does not come out of the heart of things; it seems rather to have been welded together.

There is no life in his characters. Adam and Eve are beautiful, graceful objects, but no one has breathed the Pygmalion life into them; they remain cold statues. Milton's sympathies were with things rather than men; the scenery and phenomena of nature, the gardens, the trim gardens, the burning lake; but as for the phenomena of mind, he was not able to see them. He has no delineation of mind except Satan, of which we may say that Satan has his own character.

[*Lecture IX.* is wanting in the manuscript. The following points from the notice in the *Examiner* may serve to preserve continuity in the present sketch. The French as a nation 'go together,' as the Italians do not; but it is physical and animal going together, not that of any steady, final purpose. Voltaire, full of wit and extraordinary talents, but nothing final in him. All modern scepticism is mere contradiction, discovering no new truth. Voltaire kind-hearted and 'beneficent,' however. French genius has produced nothing original. Montaigne, an honest sceptic. Excessive unction of Rabelais' humour. Rousseau's world-influencing egotism. Bayle, a dull writer.]

Lecture X.—The French, as we have seen, sowed nothing in the seedfield of time; Voltaire, on the contrary, casting firebrands among the dry leaves, produced the combustion we shall notice by-and-by. No province of knowledge was cultivated except in an unfruitful, desert way. Thus politics summed themselves up in the *Contrat Social* of Rousseau. The only use intellect was put to was to ask why things were there, and to account for it and argue about it. So it was all over Europe in the eighteenth century. The quack was established, and the only belief held was 'that money will buy money's worth, and that pleasure is pleasant.' In England this

¹¹ So Taine, in his more abstract way, says that Milton sums up the Renaissance and the Reformation.

baneful spirit was not so deep as in France: partly because the Teutonic nature is slower, deeper than the French; partly because England was a free Protestant country. Still it was an age of logic, not of faith; an age of talk, striving to prove faith and morality by speech; unaware that logic never proved any truths but those of mathematics, and that all great things are silent things. 'In spite of early training I never do see sorites of logic hanging together, put in regular order, but I conclude that it is going to end in some measure in some miserable delusion.'

However imperfect the literature of England was at this period, its spirit was never greater; it did great things, it built great towns, Birmingham and Liverpool, cyclopean workshops, and ships. There was sincerity there at least, Arkwright and Watt were evidently sincere. Another symptom of the earnestness of the period was that thing we call Methodism. The fire in Whitfield—fire, not logic—was unequalled since Peter the Hermit.

As to literature, 'in Queen Anne's time, after that most disgraceful class of people—King Charles's people—had passed away, there appeared the milder kind of unbelief, complete formalism. Yet there were many beautiful indications of better things.' 'Addison was a mere lay preacher completely bound up in formalism, but he did get to say many a true thing in his generation.' Steele had infinitely more *naïveté*, but he subordinated himself to Addison.

It is a cold vote in Addison's favour that one gives. By far the greatest man of that time, I think, was Jonathan Swift, Dean Swift, a man entirely deprived of his natural nourishment, but of great robustness, of genuine Saxon mind, not without a feeling of reverence, though from circumstances it did not awaken in him. . . . He saw himself in a world of confusion and falsehood; no eyes were clearer to see it than his.

Being of acrid temperament, he took up what was fittest for him, 'sarcasm mainly, and he carried it quite to an epic pitch. There is something great and fearful in his irony'—which yet shows sometimes sympathy and a sort of love for the thing he satirises. By nature he was one of the truest of men, with great pity for his fellow-men. In Sterne

there was a great quantity of good struggling through the superficial evil. He terribly failed in the discharge of his duties, still we must admire in him that sporting kind of geniality and affection, a son of our common mother, not cased up in buckram formulas. . . . We cannot help feeling his immense love for things around him, so that we may say of him as of Magdalen, 'Much is forgiven him because he loved much.'

As for Pope,

he was one of the finest heads ever known, full of deep sayings, and uttering them in the shape of couplets, rhymed couplets.¹²

¹² It is interesting to compare Thackeray's estimates of Swift and Sterne with Carlyle's.

The two persons who exercised the most remarkable influence upon things during the eighteenth century were unquestionably Samuel Johnson¹³ and David Hume, 'two summits of a great set of influences, two opposite poles of it. . . . There is not such a cheering spectacle in the eighteenth century as Samuel Johnson.' He contrived to be devout in it; he had a belief and held by it, a genuine inspired man. Hume's eye, unlike Johnson's, was not open to faith, yet he was of a noble perseverance, a silent strength.

The *History of England* failed to get buyers; he bore it all like a Stoic, like a heroic silent man as he was, and then proceeded calmer to the next thing he had to do. I have heard old people, who have remembered Hume well, speak of his great good humour under trials, the quiet strength of it; the very converse in this of Dr. Johnson, whose coarseness was equally strong with his heroisms.

As an historian, Hume 'always knows where to begin and end. In his *History* he frequently rises, though a cold man naturally, into a kind of epic height as he proceeds.' His scepticism went to the very end, so that 'all could see what was in it, and give up the unprofitable employment of spinning cobwebs of logic in their brain.' His fellow-historian, Robertson, was a shallow man, with only a power of arrangement, and 'a soft sleek style.' Gibbon, a far greater historian than Robertson, was not so great as Hume. 'With all his swagger and bombast, no man ever gave a more futile account of human things than he has done in the *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*.'

Lecture XI.—It is very strange to contrast Hume, the greatest of all the writers of his time, and in some respects the worthiest, with Dante; to contrast scepticism with faith. 'Dante saw a solemn law in the universe pointing out his destiny with an awful and beautiful certainty, and he held to it. Hume could see nothing in the universe but confusion, and he was certain of nothing but his own existence. Yet he had instincts which were infinitely more true than the logical part of him, and so he kept himself quiet in the middle of it all, and did no harm to any one.' But scepticism is a disease of the mind, a fatal condition to be in, or at best useful only as a means to get at knowledge; and to spend one's time reducing realities to theories is to be in an enchanted state of mind. Morality, the very centre of the existence of man, was in the eighteenth century reduced to a theory—by Adam Smith to a theory of the sympathies and Moral Sense; by Hume to expediency, 'the most melancholy theory ever propounded.' Besides morality, everything else was in the same state.

A dim, huge, immeasurable steam-engine they had made of this world, and, as Jean Paul says, heaven became a gas; God, a force; the second world, a grave. . . .

¹³ The criticism on Johnson, being to the same effect as that of Carlyle's essay, I pass over.

In that huge universe become one vast steam-engine, as it were, the new generation that followed must have found it a very difficult position to be in, and perfectly insupportable for them, to be doomed to live in such a place of falsehood and chimera; and that was in fact the case with them, and it led to the second great phenomenon we have to notice—the introduction of Wertherism.¹⁴

Werther was right:—

If the world were really no better than what Goethe imagined it to be, there was nothing for it but suicide; if it had nothing to support itself upon but these poor sentimentalities, view-hunting trivialities, this world was really not fit to live in. But in the end the conviction that this theory of the world was wrong came to Goethe himself, greatly to his own profit, greatly to the world's profit.

The same phenomenon shows itself in Schiller's *Robbers*. Life to the robber seems one huge bedlam, and a brave man can do nothing with it but revolt against it. In our own literature Byron represents a similar phasis. He is full of 'rage and scowl against the whole universe as a place not worthy that a genuine man should live in it. He seems to have been a compound of the Robbers and Werther put together.' This sentimentalism is the ultimatum of scepticism. That theory of the universe cannot be true; for if it were there would be no other way for it but Werther's, to put an end to it; for all mankind 'to return to the bosom of their Father with a sort of dumb protest against it. There was, therefore, a deep sincerity in the sentimentalism, not a right kind of sincerity perhaps, but still a struggling towards it.'¹⁵

All this—scepticism, sentimentalism, theorising, dependence on the opinion of others, wages taken and no duty done—went on and on. And then came the consummation of scepticism. 'We can well conceive the end of the last century, the crisis which then took place, the prurience of self-conceit, the talk of illumination, the darkness of confusion.' The new French kind of belief was belief in the doctrine of Rousseau, 'a kind of half-madman, but of tender pity too, struggling for sincerity through his whole life, till his own vanity and egotism drove him quite blind and desperate.' Then appeared one of the frightfullest phenomena ever seen among men, the French Revolution. 'It was after all a new revelation of an old truth to this unfortunate people; they beheld, indeed, the truth there clad in hell-fire, but they got the truth.' It began in all the golden radiance of hope; it is impossible to doubt the perfect sincerity of the men. At first 'for the upper class of people it was the joyfulest

¹⁴ A notice, far from accurate, of the origin of Goethe's *Werther* here follows, and the time is thus characterised by the future historian of Frederick: 'It was a time of haggard condition; no genuine hope in men's minds; all outwards was false—the last war for example, the Seven Years' War, the most absurd of wars ever undertaken, on no public principle, a contest between France and Germany, from Frederick the Great wanting to have Silesia, and Louis the Fifteenth wanting to give Madame de Pompadour some influence in the affairs of Europe; and 50,000 men were shot for that purpose.'

¹⁵ A notice of *Goetz von Berlichingen* follows.

of news; now at last they had got something to do; . . . certainly to starve to death is hard, but not so hard as to idle to death.'

But the French theory of life was false—that men are to do their duty in order to give happiness to themselves and one another. And where dishonest and foolish people are, there will always be dishonesty and folly; we can't distil knavery into honesty. Europe rose and assembled and came round France, and tried to crush the Revolution, but could not crush it at all. 'It was the primeval feeling of nature they came to crush, but [the spirit of France¹⁶] rallied, and stood up and asserted itself, and made Europe know even in the marrow of its bones that it was there.' Bonaparte set his foot on the necks of the nations of Europe. Bonaparte himself was a reality at first, the great armed soldier of democracy, with a true appreciation of the Revolution, as opening the career to all talents; but at last he became a poor egotist, and, stirring up the old Berserkir rage against him, he burned himself up in a day. 'On the whole, the French Revolution was only a great outburst of the truth that the world wasn't a mere chimera, but a great reality.'

Having seen how scepticism burned itself up, it becomes interesting to inquire (*Lecture XII.*), What are we to look for now? Are we to reckon on a new period of things, of better infinitely extending hopes? We do see good in store for us. The fable of the phoenix rising out of its own ashes, which was interpreted by the rise of modern Europe out of the Roman Empire, is interpreted again in the French Revolution. On the spiritual side of things we see the phoenix in the modern school of German literature.¹⁷ We might inquire, What new doctrine is it that is now proposed to us? What is the meaning of German literature? But this question is not susceptible of any immediate answer, for German literature has no particular theory at all in the front of it. The object of the men who constructed it was not to save the world, but to work out in some manner an enfranchisement for their own souls. And—

seeing here the blessed, thrice-blessed phenomenon of men un mutilated in all that constitutes man, able to believe and be in all things men, seeing this, I say, there is here the thing that has all other things presupposed in it. . . . To explain, I can only think of the Revelation, for I can call it no other, that these men made to me. It was to me like the rising of a light in the darkness which lay around, and threatened to swallow me up. I was then in the very midst of Wertherism, the blackness and darkness of death. There was one thing in particular struck me in Goethe. It is in his *Wilhelm Meister*. He had been describing an association of all sorts of people of talent, formed to receive propositions and give responses to them, all of which he described with a sort of seriousness at first, but with irony at the last. However, these people had their eyes on Wilhelm Meister, with great

¹⁶ Word omitted in MS.

¹⁷ Carlyle is assured that there are few in his audience able to read German, but anticipates a better time.

cunning watching over him at a distance at first, not interfering with him too soon; at last the man who was intrusted with the management of the thing took him in hand, and began to give him an account of how the association acted. Now this is the thing, which, as I said, so much struck me. He tells Wilhelm Meister that a number of applications for advice were daily made to the association, which were answered thus and thus; but that many people wrote in particular for recipes of happiness; all *that*, he adds, was laid on the shelf, and not answered at all. Now this thing gave me great surprise when I read it. 'What!' I said, 'is it not the recipe of happiness that I have been seeking all my life, and isn't it precisely because I have failed in finding it that I am now miserable and discontented?' Had I supposed, as some people do, that Goethe was fond of paradoxes, that this was consistent with the sincerity and modesty of the man's mind, I had certainly rejected it without further trouble; but I couldn't think it. At length, after turning it up a great while in my own mind, I got to see that it was very true what he said—that it was the thing that all the world were in error in. No man has a right to ask for a recipe for happiness; he can do without happiness; there is something better than that. All kinds of men who have done great things—priests, prophets, sages—have had in them something higher than the love of happiness to guide them, spiritual clearness and perfection, a far better thing than happiness. Love of happiness is but a kind of hunger at the best, a craving because I have not enough of sweet provision in this world. If I am asked what that higher thing is, I cannot at once make answer, I am afraid of causing mistake. There is no name I can give it that is not to be questioned; I couldn't speak about it; there is no name for it, but pity for that heart that does not feel it; there is no good volition in that heart. This higher thing was once named the Cross of Christ—not a happy thing *that*, surely.¹⁸

The whole of German literature is not to be reduced to a seeking of this higher thing, but such was the commencement of it. The philosophers of Germany are glanced at.

I studied them once attentively, but found that I got nothing out of them. One may just say of them that they are the precisely opposite to Hume. . . . This study of metaphysics, I say, had only the result, after bringing me rapidly through different phases of opinion, at last to deliver me altogether out of metaphysics. I found it altogether a frothy system, no right beginning to it, no right ending. I began with Hume and Diderot, and as long as I was with them I ran at atheism, at blackness, at materialism of all kinds. If I read Kant I arrived at precisely opposite conclusions, that all the world was spirit, namely, that there was nothing material at all anywhere; and the result was what I have stated, that I resolved for my part on having nothing more to do with metaphysics at all.

After the Werther period Goethe 'got himself organised at last, built up his mind, adjusted to what he can't cure, not suicidally grinding itself to pieces.' For a time the Ideal, Art, Painting, Poetry, were in his view the highest things, goodness being included in these. God became for him 'only a stubborn force, really a heathen kind of thing.' As his mind gets higher it becomes more serious too, uttering tones of most beautiful devoutness. 'In the *West-östlicher Divan*, though the garb is Persian, the whole spirit is Christianity, it is Goethe himself, the old poet, who goes up and down singing little

¹⁸ Compare with this passage 'the Everlasting Yea' of *Sartor Resartus*.

snatches of his own feelings on different things. It grows extremely beautiful as it goes on, full of the finest things possible, which sound like the jingling of bells when the queen of the fairies rides abroad.' ¹⁹

Of Schiller the principal characteristic is 'a chivalry of thought, described by Goethe as the spirit of freedom struggling ever forward to be free.' His *Don Carlos*

is well described as being like to a lighthouse, high, far-seen, and withal empty. It is in fact very like what the people of that day, the Girondists of the French Revolution, were always talking about, the *Bonheur du peuple* and the rest. . . . There was a nobleness in Schiller, a brotherly feeling, a kindness of sympathy for what is true and just. There was a kind of silence too at the last. He gave up his talk about the *Bonheur du peuple*, and tried to see if he could make them happier instead.

The third great writer in modern Germany is Richter.

Goethe was a strong man, as strong as the mountain rocks, but as soft as the green sward upon the rocks, and like them continually bright and sun-beshone. Richter, on the contrary, was what he has been called, a half-made man; he struggled with the world, but was never completely triumphant over it. But one loves Richter. . . . There is more joyous laughter in the heart of Richter than in any other German writer.

We have then much reason to hope about the future; great things are in store for us.

It is possible for us to attain a spiritual freedom compared with which political enfranchisement is but a name. . . . I can't close this lecture better than by repeating these words of Richter, *Thou, Eternal Providence, wilt cause the day to dawn.*

Nothing now remains for me but to take my leave of you—a sad thing at all times that word, but doubly so in this case. When I think of what you are, and of what I am, I cannot help feeling that you have been kind to me; I won't trust myself to say how kind; but you have been as kind to me as ever audience was to man, and the gratitude which I owe you comes to you from the bottom of my heart. May God be with you all!

EDWARD DOWDEN.

¹⁹ A defence of Goethe from the charges of over-serenity and political indifference follows.

THE NEW IRISH LAND BILL.

THE RESERVE which is observed in each House of Parliament upon the subject of measures which are before the other, made it impossible for me, in speaking in the House of Lords on the 8th of April, to do more than indicate in the most general terms the principal objection which I entertain to the Irish Land Bill of the Government. The same reticence need not be observed in discussion 'out of doors;' and indeed it seems to be almost the duty of those who have given much attention to an important subject, that they should contribute what they can to the public consideration of it.

Let me in the first place deprecate the attitude of mind which is impatient of all argument on the subject. It is an attitude not only common: it is prevalent. 'Something must be done, never mind what.' The weary cycles of Irish discontent, the savage and too often the disgusting crimes, the odious requirements of repression—all these may well drive us, at moments, into conduct born of mere recklessness and despair. There is, indeed, a time for everything. There are moments in politics, as in other affairs, when ordinary rules must be suspended. But no time can ever come when in the work of permanent legislation we can afford to forget what that work involves for the future as well as for the present. Least of all can such forgetfulness be afforded when one of the greatest evils we have to deal with is a chaos of opinion—a confounding of the plainest distinctions not only in matters of fact and of policy, but in morals. Simply to yield without caring to think what is yielded—is not the way to mitigate but the way to aggravate that most fruitful kind of mischief. Neither the peculiar social problems of Ireland nor those of any other country can be solved in such a spirit. It is one thing to act upon a real political necessity; it is another thing to go beyond the action which that necessity requires. It is yet another thing—and a very different thing indeed—ourselves to create or to aggravate the necessities to which we profess to yield, and to raise a new crop of such necessities for those who come after us.

No politician who was responsible for the Land Act of 1870, and who defended the Disturbance Bill of 1880, can be accused of being insensible to the demands of circumstance or to the exigencies of

the moment. On the other hand, those who have agreed to exceptional measures can never justly be accused of inconsistency because they decline to advance farther and farther upon divergent paths. There were in the Land Act of 1870, as there are in every part of our constitution, a great many so-called 'principles' involved which, if carried farther, would effectually destroy other 'principles' of far more fundamental obligation. It must never be forgotten that in politics, as well as in higher matters, the limits within which a principle is applied are, or may be, an essential part of that principle itself. The whole system of government under which we live depends on our constant recollection or on our instinctive sense of this truth.

In the present paper I wish to put on record some of the principal objections I entertain to the proposals of her Majesty's Government for the further alteration of the law affecting the Ownership and Occupancy of land in Ireland.

The fundamental principle of these objections may be stated in a few words. Every measure which can be prudently and justly taken with a view to increase the number of the Owners of land in Ireland is a measure tending in the right direction. On the other hand, every measure which tends gratuitously to impair or destroy Ownership altogether, by cutting out of it some of its most essential elements, and by reducing all Owners, more or less completely, to the position of mere rent-chargers, must be a measure tending in the wrong direction, not only at the present moment but for all time to come.

It has long been one of the professed aims of the Liberal party to modify or remove the restrictions which constitute what is called 'limited Ownership' in land,—with the great object of making every Owner as immediately and as directly interested as possible in the good management of his property. Legislation—however exceptional, provided only it be just—with a view to increase as rapidly as possible the number of persons who own land in Ireland, is, in my view, most expedient. Legislation tending unduly and needlessly to limit the freedom of such Ownership, when it has been acquired, is, in my view, not only inexpedient, but mischievous in the highest degree.

These two lines of legislation are not only different, but they are opposite in direction. Tenants may well refrain from buying those incidents of ownership which they expect, by agitation, to get for nothing. Capitalists who are not tenants will be little tempted to invest their money in land if they cannot buy with it the powers essential for its management. Thus the value of the Purchase Clauses will be destroyed, or much diminished, by the Occupancy Clauses. It will do little good to multiply the number of Owners in Ireland if they are to be deprived of the powers which are essential to the discharge of those functions in which the whole virtue of Ownership consists. The thoughtlessness prevalent on this subject is astonishing.

In Ireland it is now commonly laid down as an indisputable proposition that if a landowner receives a certain annual rent it is all he requires, and that everything else he values in Ownership is a 'mere sentiment.' This is true only in the same sense in which it is true that 'sentiment' is the one great power which gives force and dignity to all the pursuits of life. Even in those callings in which the love of money seems to be predominantly concerned, men can and do get deeply interested in better things. In the excellence of the products in which they deal—in the skill of their workmen—in the satisfaction of customers—in the contribution they make to the wants of others and to the material progress of the world,—in one or other of these ways all men in all callings do contrive to cherish and to be impelled by 'sentiments' other and better than those which are inspired by the mere enjoyment of money. The Ownership of land may at least be credited with some share in this higher savour among the pursuits of life. The management of an estate is, or ought to be, as much a business as the management of any other concern. The 'sentiment' which delights in seeing the improvement of a landed property is a sentiment of the highest value to the State. No man could count the millions which, under the stimulus of this 'sentiment,' have been laid out on the improvement of the soil in these kingdoms. And yet it is a kind of outlay which those who are not concerned in it may never see. In other branches of industry capital takes a more visible form. Great buildings, forests of chimneys, miles of houses, the confused noises of machinery—these are all evident to the eye or to the ear. But the investments of capital in the soil often, like the dead, 'lie silent underground,' or are visible only in changes of vegetation which the mine-owner or the mill-owner would never notice. Not, generally, in great works which catch the eye; not in gigantic reclamations which are trumpeted in newspapers; but in the ceaseless outflows of continual interest and attention—now on this farm, now on that; now on one field, now on another—has this 'sentiment' of Ownership been fertilising and reclaiming land for generations past. It has at least as high elements in it as the sentiment which prevails in any other secular pursuit whatever. It may pay, but it never pays highly. Men are not incited to it merely, or even mainly, by the love of money. The doctrine that they ought to be contented with the position of mere rent-chargers is a doctrine founded on the ignorance or the prejudices of those who know nothing themselves of the management of land. Every act of legislation which is inspired by this doctrine will not only be unjust as regards the present time, but most injurious for all time to come.

This would be true anywhere. But it is even more true of Ireland than of any other country in the world. If the unfortunate history of that country has led, and indeed has almost compelled, many land-owners there to be contented with the position of mere rent-receivers,

or has discouraged or prevented them from having any other, there is all the more reason and necessity for favouring the change in this matter which has undoubtedly been in progress. If there has been one fact brought out more clearly than another by the evidence taken before the Commission, it is the large and unacknowledged share which landowners have frequently contributed to the improvement of Ireland. There is, indeed, an immense range of variation as to the practice in this respect—a range of variation which all the more condemns legislation which is founded on general assumptions and which gives indiscriminate rights. I doubt whether in any part of England or of Scotland an instance could be found of more spirited outlay than that which has been detailed before the Commission as the outlay of the Duke of Leinster and of some other landowners on the main drainage of an important district.¹ Only one general assumption on this matter would be safe, and that is, that the ‘sentiment’ of Ownership should be encouraged and developed to the highest possible degree. Ireland needs, above all things, an active and enterprising Ownership in land. In most parts of England the land has been under cultivation for centuries. Its condition has been the result of the outlay of many generations of Owners, and of the labour of many generations of tenants. In such cases, the existing Owner may have comparatively little to do except to keep buildings and other improvements abreast of the science of the time. But Ireland is, as regards a large portion of it, a country in a backward stage of agricultural industry. There is a vast amount of land which may be reclaimed. There is another vast amount of land only half cultivated, which requires to be thoroughly improved. Above all, in a large part of Ireland the tillage of the people is so rude, their habits so antiquated, and their holdings so scattered and so miserable, that it is very often an indispensable preliminary to all improvement that they should be re-arranged and more or less consolidated. Every ‘sentiment’ which can induce capital and enterprise and knowledge to come to the help of sluggishness and ignorance and poverty, in such a country, ought to be stimulated and encouraged, instead of being checked by legislation and denounced in speeches.

There is, therefore, obviously the strongest objection in principle to every limitation on the Ownership of land in Ireland which is not justified or demanded under one or other of these three following categories:—

1. Limitations arising out of rights, legal or equitable, acquired by existing Occupiers from contract, or from usages capable of being supported by reasonable evidence before a Court.

2. Limitations which can be honestly said to be essential to the conduct of agriculture as a business.

¹ Bessborough Commission Report, vol. iii. Q. 40, 523.

3. Limitations intended for the exceptional protection of extreme helplessness and poverty.

These are limitations which give the widest scope to the recognition of every local circumstance, and all the special conditions of Ireland.

Under the first of these heads came all the limitations imposed by the Act of 1870 in clothing with legal force the Ulster custom and all other similar usages wherever their existence could be proved, as applicable to each individual case. In doing this the Act went very far: because many of the usages thus legally enforced had never been of the certain and accepted character which alone constitutes a legal custom in England. Many of them were nothing more than the rules or allowances of individual liberality on the part of owners—allowances which were thus entirely changed in character.

Under the second of these heads came all the limitations imposed by the same Act, securing compensation for improvements, and for the encouragement of leases.

Under the third head came the Disturbance Clauses, which were avowedly of an exceptional character, and were carefully framed, and as carefully explained, so as to exclude the idea that they were intended to acknowledge a divided Ownership, and to make it plain that they were intended simply to compensate for disturbance in a profitable business. Nothing could be more definite and precise than the language of Mr. Gladstone in 1870 in explaining the 'Disturbance' Clauses:—'That which is our main contention is this—that the great remedy which, apart from custom, ought to be provided for the Irish Occupier, should be provided for him in the shape of a shelter against eviction, but not on the footing of a joint property in the soil. When he has paid his money that gives him such a property—inconvenient as it may be—with the consent, or the fairly presumed consent, of his landlord, he is entitled to be protected. But I am not prepared, nor are any of my colleagues, to admit that the just protection of him affords either an apology or a reason for endowing him with a joint property in the soil.' And, be it observed, this disclaimer did not rest only, or even mainly, on the declarations of the Government. It rested on the structure of the Act. If the compensation for disturbance had been intended as the price of a right of property, that price would have been higher in proportion to the size and value of the holding. But, on the contrary, the rate of compensation was graduated on a scale decreasing with size and value, and increasing with smallness and poverty.

It is now proposed to confer by law upon every tenant in Ireland (except existing lease-holders), indiscriminately, and without the least reference to the fact whether he has ever acquired it, or had the smallest reason to claim it, a right to sell his holding 'for the best price that can be got'—that is, to the highest bidder, unless the Owner can object to that bidder on some specified ground proved

before a legal Court. There are limitations proposed in respect to price and in respect to the division of the price to which I shall refer presently. But these do not affect the proposition that the right to sell is to be bestowed universally and indiscriminately. This indiscriminate right of sale is to be given by statute, however such right may have been excluded when the tenant took his farm; or however little he may have earned it by special outlay; or however much the Owner may have himself executed the improvements—or however much in other ways the saleable value of the farm may have arisen from causes with which the tenant has had nothing to do.

I wish it to be distinctly understood that my objection to the right of selling Occupancies lies only against giving it universally and indiscriminately. I do not speak of the right of sale established and regulated by mutual agreement: nor of the right of sale as gained by custom and acquired by purchase: nor of the right of sale agreed to by the Owner as an alternative to paying ‘compensation for disturbance:’ nor of the right of sale similarly agreed to as compensation for improvements. I speak, and speak only, of the right of sale given universally—as an inseparable incident of agricultural tenure—irrespective of all special circumstances and of all the conditions on which men may have let and hired yearly tenancies in Ireland.

This sweeping proposal cannot be defended on the ground of any rights which have been equitably acquired; because it is to apply to all cases without discrimination. It cannot be defended on the ground that it is necessary for the successful prosecution of agriculture; because the best agriculture in the world is to be found where no such right of sale exists, or could be entertained. It cannot be defended on the ground that it is required for the protection of mere poverty and helplessness; because it embraces thousands of tenancies in respect to which no such circumstances can be pleaded.

A law so regardless of the varieties of circumstance, and of the equities which are inseparable from them, will constitute an entirely new system of things,—involving, if not by the strictest logic, yet at least by the most powerful and insuperable implications of popular feeling,—the idea and all the consequences of a divided Ownership, with the benefits of full Ownership left to nobody. The universal and indiscriminate right of selling Occupancies given to all yearly tenants without the least reference to any legitimate expectation or method of acquiring it, constitutes a share, and it may be a large share, of Ownership, suddenly transferred from those who now have it, and who may have sacrificed much to keep it, to those who have never had it, and have never paid one sixpence for it.

I could not use the argument which seeks to identify or even to connect this new statutory right of selling Occupancies with the common law of assignment. It may be perfectly true that by

the common law of Ireland, as by the common law of England, Occupiers, in the absence of agreement to the contrary, have a right of assigning their own interest, whatever that might be. But they could not assign an interest larger or greater than that which they themselves possessed. They could not give away that which was not their own to give. By law the Owner had the right to turn out the assignee when the interest which had been assigned to him had expired. This counter right, inseparable from Ownership, was as essential a part of the law as the right of assignment. It is surely, therefore, a most misleading representation of the conditions under which men have long acquired both the Ownership and the Occupancy of land in Ireland to put forward the right of assignment as fundamental, and the counter right by which it was limited and qualified as accidental or adventitious. The opposite position—the very converse—is the truth. The argument which confounds the new right of sale with the old privilege of assignment is purely technical. The argument, on the other hand, which maintains the right of the Owner to have an effective choice in the selection of his own tenant is founded on all the considerations alike of policy and of equity which affect the case. The Owner has, and he ought to be encouraged to feel that he has, a paramount interest in the character and in the qualifications of those who hire his land. In no country in the world is this just interest exposed to such dangers as in Ireland. There is abundant evidence taken before the Commission which proves how violent and unscrupulous many of the Irish Tenants are in their dealings with each other; and how exacting towards the labouring classes who have no land. The right of assignment, therefore, not only always was, but always ought to be, absolutely qualified and limited by the counter rights and by the duties of Ownership. Under this qualification and limitation, and out of the balance between the two rights, the sale of holdings becomes of necessity a matter of arrangement and agreement between the Owner and the Occupier. I do not for a moment argue that under such agreements the sale of holdings may not, under the conditions which prevail in many parts of Ireland, be both a just and a convenient arrangement. I have, indeed, reason to know that it has sometimes many advantages, as, for example, where it provides quietly for the consolidation of small holdings by enabling the more wealthy tenants to buy out the poorer, and so to remove them without the evils and dangers of eviction. But such conditions are essentially local. They furnish no justification, and, in my opinion, no excuse for a compulsory law, making the right of sale inseparable from the tenure of land on hire under all circumstances and in all parts of Ireland. .

Then there is another argument used in support of this universal and indiscriminate right of selling Occupancies, which seems to me quite as indefensible as the last. It is said that under the Disturbance

Clauses of the Act of 1870 we did give an 'interest' to Occupiers which has in fact been found to have a money value. It is urged that therefore we ~~must~~ allow, or may as well allow, this 'interest' to be saleable. But is it possible to sustain the doctrine that every valuable 'interest' which a man may have, he must necessarily be entitled to transfer by sale to anybody else? That valuable interest may be so interwoven with the superior or with the concurrent rights of other men, that, on the contrary, it may involve the greatest possible injustice that the law should step in to enable him to sell it. How would this doctrine of the universal and compulsory saleability of all valuable 'interests' be tolerated in the commercial world? What 'interest' is more valuable than a partnership in a thriving commercial business? But does it follow that the law should interfere to make all such interests liable to sale? And what would it avail, in arguing for such a proposal, to point out the indisputable fact that such 'interests' do possess a money value, and that men are able to borrow money on the security they afford? Personal qualities which are incapable of proof or even of appreciation before a Court of Law are of the essence of a thousand valuable 'interests;' but these interests are so interwoven with the rights and the dearest interests of other men, that it would involve the greatest possible injustice compulsorily to make them saleable. The Owners and Occupiers of land are, in some respects, in the position of partners in one of the most important industries in the world. Nor is there one in which personal qualities may be of higher moment and account. There may be cases—in Ireland there may be thousands of cases—in which it is a matter of indifference to the Owner whether one man or another is tenant of a holding. But there may be also, and there are, thousands of other cases in which no such indifference prevails. Indeed it may be said with truth that such indifference, where it does exist, is one of the bad features of a condition of things which it is the highest interest of the State to discourage rather than to encourage and to perpetuate. There is an increasing number of landowners in Ireland who are sensible of the duties of their position, and whose great desire is to choose tenants who are active, skilful, and industrious. To all these the universal saleability of farms will be 'a heavy blow and a great discouragement.'

But, even if it could be asserted, which it cannot, that all the existing tenants of Ireland have by usages or expectations, however indefinite, acquired this right of selling their farms, what excuse can be offered for affixing this right indelibly to all future tenancies? The Act of 1870 carefully provided that even in Ulster and elsewhere, whilst this right of sale was to be respected and protected whenever it had been acquired, it might be bought up and paid off, so that the farm might be cleared of it for evermore.

Under this provision an inducement was held out to enterprising

and improving Owners that at least by purchase they could regain that complete freedom of dealing in their land which is the only healthy condition of business of any kind. But now it is proposed to cut off even this hope for the application of Owners' capital to the improvement of Ireland. A man may buy up and pay off every existing right or expectation; he may buy up every new right given by this new proposed law; he may lay out his money in buildings, in drainage, and in reclamation; but he is never to be allowed to let the land so freed and so improved except under the disheartening condition imposed by law, that the man to whom he lets it is to have the power of selling it the very next day, or month, or year, to some one else of whom the Owner may know nothing, or of whom he may have the best reason to believe the worst.

Let us look at the operation of such a law in combination with the new scheme for increasing the number of the Owners of land in Ireland. Let us take the favourite case of a tenant who has done whatever has been done in the way of improvement. Under the new Purchase Clauses he buys his own farm; and it is expected that under the stimulus of Ownership and of the 'sentiment' which it inspires, he adds greatly to the improvements which he had executed before. He builds a better house; he drains his land better; he makes new fences; he reclaims bits of bog or bits of mountain. Suddenly there happens to him some one of the many contingencies of life which changes or arrests its usual course. He becomes unable to cultivate his farm himself as he had been wont to do. But his attachment to the spot, always great, has become greater still. Another generation is coming on, and to one or other of his sons, when they are older, he desires and hopes to continue the home and the property he has acquired. In the mean time, for perhaps some five or ten years, it may be almost indispensable that he should let his farm. Under the proposal of this Bill he will be unable to do so without the tenant acquiring an inalienable right to sell the Occupancy to some third person who may be a bad farmer and a litigious man, or who may be obnoxious to the Owner for many reasons which he could never make good in a Court of Law. Is it possible to defend such a law as this on any plea of either justice or expediency? This, however, is only one out of a hundred cases which might be put. There is no distinction in justice or in principle between a new proprietor who has bought, and an old proprietor who has inherited, his land, except this: that existing Owners are more likely to be encountered and encumbered by subordinate interests equitably acquired. But even on the oldest estates there will be many cases in which no such interests exist—or where they may be extinguished—or where the Owner desires to let a farm which he has himself improved and furnished. There is no conceivable reason why in such cases, or in others which might be specified, Owners should be prohibited by law from letting their

land without the power of sale attaching to the occupancy. Such a prohibition goes far beyond anything which can be justified on the plea of defending local usages. It is a gratuitous introduction of the evils of divided Ownership where it did not exist before, and a standing impediment in the way of any return in Ireland to a healthier condition of things.

I admit, indeed, that the Bill of the Government makes a gallant, and I am sure a sincere, attempt to avoid or to mitigate the evils which have often been pointed out as the accompaniment of what is called 'Free Sale.' It is proposed to put statutory limitations on that freedom which shall qualify the initial declaration of the first clause that the Occupier may sell 'for the best price that can be got.' These limitations have two objects in view. One is to prevent, as far as it may be possible to prevent, the exaction of extravagant prices for the 'goodwill' or occupancy of farms. The other object of the limitations is to secure to the Owner some share in the selling price of his own farms, where a recognisable portion of that price ought clearly in equity to belong to him. Both of these objects are essential—one of them in respect to policy, the other of them in respect to justice. If the selling price of Occupancies were to be unlimited, the whole advantage of low rents would be intercepted by the individuals who happen to be Occupiers at the present time, and not one shilling of that advantage would pass on to the Occupiers of the future. And so likewise if these existing Occupiers are to be allowed to carry off, in all cases and under all circumstances, the whole selling value which may have arisen from the sacrifices which Owners have made in the shape of cheap rents, or from the outlay they have made in the shape of improvements, there would be a wholesale and most unjust transfer of property from one class to the other. The Government does recognise both these obvious truths, and the Bill does endeavour to respect them. But these are exactly the principles on which even in Ulster the right of sale has been regulated and limited by various rules on various estates, and it is precisely against these rules and regulations that the most strenuous resistance has arisen and the most violent condemnation has been pronounced. Even if the statutory limitations, which are to come in the place of the limitations imposed by custom and by agreement, were in themselves perfectly well framed, the question arises how far they are likely to be permanent. Mere logic in politics does not always run its course. But there are conditions of pressure under which it does, and very quickly too. Moreover, under these conditions the logic is apt to be very loose and very one-sided. The inferences which have been drawn from the Act of 1870, and the arguments which, as we have seen, have been founded on it, show that such conditions are present in all their force when we give new rights by law. The Bill gives new impulse to the forces which tend to override every limitation, however much that limitation may be founded either on policy

or on justice. The universal right of sale given to all Occupiers indiscriminately and without any reference to pre-existing rights, or even pre-existing expectations, or to varieties of circumstance, is a right which has it in its very nature to swell and grow, and to eat up every other right, however equitable, which comes across its path.

There is, as it seems to me, a curious illustration of this tendency in the Bill itself, and in the very definition of the limitations which it is proposed to put upon the tenant's right to sell that which has never been his own. It is proposed by the Bill that if the improvements on a farm have been done by the Owner, he may apply to the Court to have such improvements valued, and any moneys found due to him on such valuation shall be paid to him out of the purchase moneys of the tenancy. The principle of this provision is of obvious necessity if any regard whatever is to be paid to equity. But there is this curious deduction made---that the Court may find that the landlord's right to the value of his own improvements has been adequately met and compensated 'by increased rent or otherwise.' Now let us look at the idea and the principle which is involved in this deduction from the general provision.

If I execute improvements upon land hired from another man, there is an excellent and most equitable reason why my interest in those improvements should be exhaustible by lapse of time. That equitable reason lies in this---that the results of the improvement I have executed are due not only to my capital, or to my labour, but also to the capital of the Owner invested in and represented by the qualities of the soil. When, therefore, I have reaped the results of the improvement for a time long enough to repay me the capital I have laid out, with interest, and perhaps a handsome profit,---then the time has come when the Owner becomes justly entitled to a substantial share in the results which have been so largely due to that which belonged to him. But, it is a turning of the tables indeed to maintain that an Owner can ever lose by any lapse of time his right of property in his own improvements upon his own land. The mere payment of rent for land so improved, however long that payment may continue, can never give the Occupier any right to that to which he has contributed nothing. If I hire land which is not only owned, but has also been improved, by another man, then the rent which I may pay him for the right of cultivation can never by any lapse of time entitle me to any share whatever in the selling value of that which is entirely and exclusively his. If by the mere payment of rent I can ever be entitled to possess myself of the selling value of the capital which he has invested in improvements, then on the same principle the mere continuous payment of rent may entitle me to possess myself also of that other portion of his capital which has been invested in the Ownership of the soil. This is indeed a new and a very cheap way of purchasing land! It seems to be in strict accord-

ance with a speech made during last winter by some member of the Land League who told the tenants whom he was addressing that they had paid rent for so many years that they had paid the capital value of their farms over and over again, and they might now fairly claim them as their own.

Perhaps I am wrong in the interpretation I put on this strange subsection of the first clause of the Land Bill ; and if I am right I feel sure that it will be altered. But if such consequences as these are capable of being drawn from the right of sale by those who are led to follow them in the drafting of a Bill, how much more easily will unjust and extravagant consequences be drawn in the imagination of Irish tenants under the stimulus not only of self-interest but of political agitation !

These are some of the direct consequences of this proposal. But the indirect consequences are numberless, and equally open to objection.

The universal and perpetual statutory right of sale must carry with it the perpetual exclusion of freedom of bargain in respect to rent. In a healthy condition of agriculture, and among a people with an adequate and civilised standard of life, a farm let at its market value ought not to have any saleable value in addition to the rent. Therefore, to keep up the perpetual saleability of farms, there must be a perpetual provision for keeping down the marketability of rents. This may be tolerable, and even necessary for the protection of men who have bought or have otherwise equitably acquired a saleable interest. It is unreasonable for the protection of men who have simply hired land without having paid anything whatever for goodwill, and still more of men who step into a holding equipped by the Owner.

Even as regards existing tenants in Ulster and elsewhere who have acquired or who have been allowed a right of sale, there is obviously the utmost difficulty in laying down any principle on which any definite proportion is to be maintained between the letting value and the saleable interest. In what shares the Owner and the Occupier are to divide the total value of a farm is a question on which there is no intelligible rule to guide us. This is a difficulty to be borne as best it may where a *quasi* joint Ownership has been established by custom, and when that custom may itself supply some standard of valuation. But to raise this difficulty gratuitously where it does not now exist, and to stereotype it by law for all future generations, seems to me to be indefensible, and at variance with the practice and with the legislation of all civilised nations on the Ownership and Occupancy of land.

It is a matter of great importance to observe the connection between this universal, indelible, and permanent right of sale, and the corresponding permanence of some provision for the State regulation of rents, and the artificial abatement of them by law. Yet the Bill

distinctly and definitely professes not to contemplate or provide for this permanence of State valuations and regulations. In the case of future tenancies—tenancies created after the passing of the Bill—the Occupiers are not to have a permanent and indelible right of appealing to Courts on the subject of rents. Yet they are to have the permanent and indelible right of sale. But the right of sale would become valueless under the system of full market rates of rent. In order, therefore, to preserve this indelible right of sale, it will be contended that the State must never retire from the duty of dry-nursing every Irishman for all time to come, in the making of his bargain for a farm.

But although this is not the proposal of the Bill, and is only one of the many consequences to which the adoption of it will probably lead, the proposal which the Bill does make in respect to the State-valuation of Rents seems to me to be much too sweeping. We must remember what the new definition is of a 'present' Tenancy. It may continue to be 'present' till the crack of doom. Death does not put an end to its existence. Sale does not put an end to its existence. Even bankruptcy does not apparently in all cases put an end to its existence. It passes from generation to generation and from hand to hand for ever, or until one or other of two contingencies occurs. It may be forfeited by breach of certain conditions: or it may be extinguished by being bought up by the Landlord. Strange to say, however, there are counter-limitations even upon this power of the Landlord to buy back the complete interest in his own land. As the Bill is now drawn, it looks as if an Owner could not get rid of a 'present' Tenancy even if he buys it at the Tenant's own desire, or acquires it as the highest bidder in the open market. It is expressly enacted that 'during the first fifteen years after the passing of this Act a purchase by the Landlord of a Tenancy in exercise of his right of pre-emption shall not determine a Tenancy.' Why not? What can be the use of pretending that a 'present' tenancy has not been determined, when under any circumstances or at any time the Owner has bought out the 'present' Occupier? Such a provision is clearly not inspired by the simple policy of defending existing interests. It seems rather to be a policy hostile and discouraging to that most natural and most legitimate method of returning to, or reaching, a healthy and natural condition of things—namely, the process by which Owners may redeem the full possession of their own land. At all events the utmost possible permanence and continuity is given to the occupancy of every Tenant now holding land in Ireland. We must bear this in mind when we try to estimate the sweep and duration of an enactment which declares that every one of these men may at any time, and as often apparently as he likes, 'from time to time,' appeal to a Court to revise and to reduce his rent. Surely this is a proposition going far beyond what is required to meet even the peculiar conditions existing in Ireland. Much has been made of the vague

words used in the Report of the Richmond Commission. The words are these:—‘ Bearing in mind the system by which improvements and equipments of a farm are very generally the work of the Tenant, and the fact that a yearly Tenant is at any time liable to have his rent raised in consequence of the increased value that has been given to his holding by the expenditure of his own capital and labour, the desire for legislative interference to protect him from an arbitrary increase of rent does not seem unnatural, and we are inclined to think that by a majority of landowners it would not be objected to.’ Mr. Gladstone has argued, and I do not dispute the argument, that these words point to the establishment of a Court empowered in some measure or degree to deal with the question of rents. But there is a wide margin indeed for choice among measures which would satisfy this general proposition. I agree that there are weighty considerations of policy in the present condition of Ireland which point to the high value of some public authority being empowered to arbitrate between landlord and tenant where such arbitration is desired by both parties, or in certain limited and defined cases, where such arbitration is desired by one of them alone. The case pointed to by the Commission is clear enough. It is the case where increments of rent, undue in frequency or in amount, are charged upon Tenants who have executed improvements upon their holdings. By all means let such cases be met, and let the power of appeal be wide enough to meet them. But surely the reasonableness which may be pleaded for a proposal of this kind does not extend to the very different proposal of allowing every present Tenant in Ireland to claim from the State a revaluation and a regulation of his rent irrespective altogether of improvements, irrespective of any poverty, and irrespective of any lapse of time during which he has been paying the rent which he undertook to pay. Moreover this new right of appealing to the State for a valuation of rents does not even profess to aim at the mere checking of undue increments of rent upon improvements. It aims at revaluation upon a new basis, and with a different object altogether, that object being the establishment and defence of the indiscriminate right of sale, which may never have been contemplated by either party when farms were let and taken. In the present condition of Ireland it may be most desirable to have a Court able to mediate in those affairs which, in happier lands, are better regulated by agreement between man and man. But everything depends on the rules by which such a Court is to be guided and the aims which are set before it. I cannot admit that it ought to be the object, still less the prescribed duty, of a Court to establish and maintain an artificially low standard of rent in order to bolster up on behalf of all Occupiers, whether they have equitably acquired it or not, a right to charge a fine upon the occupation of all those who come after them.

We are often told that we must abandon all ‘ abstract ’ arguments

on this matter, and consider it only with reference to the peculiar conditions of Ireland. Well, let us do so. What, then, is said to be the one great peculiarity of that country? We are told it is the prevalence of 'earth-hunger.' But what does this mean? It means that for every Irishman who has a farm there are two, or three, or perhaps even five other Irishmen who want one. Does it follow that the best means of meeting this evil is to take every possible artificial measure to secure that the minority of Irishmen who now hold the farms should be maintained in continuous and exclusive possession of them, and that as few opportunities as possible of acquiring farms should be allowed to the majority of Irishmen who are all hungering to get them? And this artificial limitation of the supply of farms to hire is to be kept up for the indiscriminate protection of all existing holders, without reference to the question whether in each case the existing holder may not be in every respect inferior to several other Irishmen who would be delighted to get the farm, and would be much more able and much more willing to cultivate and improve it. The 'survival of the fittest' is the rule of Nature. Special and elaborate securities for the survival of the unfittest seem to be the favourite panacea for the ills of Ireland.

Let us put a case, and it is a common one. There are five Irishmen, all of whom look to the hire of land as a means of living. Let us call them respectively Huffy, Guffy, Cuffy, Ruffy, and Duffy. Huffy has got a farm which he holds at an easy rent. He has all the characteristics which belong to men accustomed to a low standard of living, and who can earn that living without exertion. His principal 'improvement' is a hovel, in which his children play with the poultry and with the pigs. The dunghill is at the door—not without heavy detachments of it inside the door. The patches of corn are yellow with weeds. But the potatoes are a fair crop, and the few cows do not fail in milk. Huffy is contented in his own way, and even happy. There may be reasons for letting him remain where he is. But these reasons have certainly no logical connection with the earth-hunger of four Irishmen out of every five. It may well be that in Huffy's case not only are there four other men ready and eager to succeed him, but either Guffy, or Cuffy, or Ruffy, or Duffy—any one of them—would make a much better tenant. Some one of them may have much more skill and energy; another of them may have more capital; and a third may have more of both. It would be immensely for the interest not only of the Owner, but of Ireland, that some one or other of these four better men should get the farm, with, of course, full compensation to Huffy for any right he may have legally or equitably acquired. Under the Land Act of 1870 this compensation may amount to about one third, or more, of the whole capital value of the land. Is it any rational remedy for the peculiar condition of earth-hunger in Ireland that we should resort to artificial legislation to keep Huffy in perpetual posses-

sion—that we should enable him to charge a heavy fine on every successor—and that we should prevent an improving Owner from choosing the best of the many better men who are willing to take the farm on reasonable conditions?

The obvious truth in this matter has been well put by Judge Longford: ‘The advocates for a general settlement of rent by valuation endeavour to bring every case within an exception by alleging that the landlord has an unfair advantage; as the tenant who applies for the farm has no other resource against starvation, and that there is undue competition, as when one farm is vacant there are six men seeking for it. There is no foundation for this argument. It is not pretended that the five men starved who did not succeed in the competition, or that the successful applicant was in utter destitution when he obtained it. On the contrary, it is probable that he had some capital to stock and cultivate the farm. He takes the farm merely to improve his condition.’

I fear that the plea founded on the ‘peculiar condition’ of Ireland is too often used, not for the purpose of meeting any vague abstraction of so-called Political Economy, but for the purpose of avoiding and evading all reasoning and all forethought on problems of legislation which, perhaps more than any other in the world, require the most of both.

The truth, indeed, is that many of the most peculiar conditions of Ireland are conditions which will be made worse and worse by needless and elaborate interferences with the intelligent management of landed property. If in the most desolate wastes—the most arid deserts of Irish poverty and misery—we see anywhere some green spot of better cultivated fields, and of more comfortable homes, there we may be sure that the result has been due to some enterprising Owner who has attained that result, and could only attain it, by operations which some parts of the new Land Bill will fatally discourage, if they will not altogether prevent.

The universal and unlimited right on the part of every ‘present’ Tenant at any time to appeal to a Court for the lowering of his rent would have a most discouraging effect on capital, and a most demoralising effect on Tenants. A man may have got his farm by out-bidding all other competitors and by giving an extravagant price for goodwill, and then, when once in possession, he may appeal against his landlord at any time, and ‘from time to time,’—may represent that his own offer was excessive, may profit by his own wrong, and may get his rent reduced. The temptation to every kind of deceit and false evidence under such a system would be insuperable.

‘If I could conceive,’ said Mr. Gladstone in March 1870, ‘a plan more calculated than anything else, first of all, for throwing into confusion the whole economical arrangements of the country; secondly for driving out of the field all solvent and honest men who might be

bidders for farms, and might desire to carry on the honourable business of agriculture; thirdly, for carrying widespread demoralisation throughout the whole mass of the Irish people, I must say, as at present advised—I confine myself to the present and until otherwise convinced—it is this plan and this demand that we should embody in our Bill, as a part of permanent legislation, a provision by which men shall be told that there shall be an authority always existing, ready to release them from the contracts they have deliberately entered into.' But such is the proposal of the new Bill, not indeed for ever, but for all the time during which all 'present tenancies' shall survive, whether they be large or small, rich or poor, under whatever circumstances of freedom and deliberation they may have been constituted at first. I have seen no reason to change the opinion thus powerfully expressed. Neither the lapse of ten years, nor the lapse of any number of years, can abate its force. It is not an extreme opinion, or one founded on any abstract dogma of Adam Smith, or of Ricardo, or of Mill. It is an opinion founded on common sense applicable to the conduct of men in all ages and in all countries, and perhaps even more applicable to the Irish character than to the character of any other nation upon earth. I rejoice indeed at the endeavour to save out of the wreck of this common sense some little floating plank of hope in the distinction which the Bill proposes to establish between present and future tenancies. But such a perpetual right to reopen bargains, and to break down contracts, when given indiscriminately to all 'present tenancies,' will certainly be demanded by, and will probably be conceded to, all tenancies of the future. There is nothing—or at least there may be nothing—to separate the two cases except an arbitrary date. Thousands of Tenants who made their bargain ten, twenty, or thirty years ago, were just as free in doing so as any Tenant who can enter upon a 'future' tenancy under this Bill when it becomes an Act. We see what has become of a distinction founded on this basis in the Act of 1870. Mr. Gladstone warned all Irishmen in 1870 that in future tenancies they must bargain for themselves. Yet every existing bargain, however old or however new, is now to be reopened. What security is there that bargains made after 1881 are to be more respected than bargains made after 1870? No man in his senses would ever invest his money or spend his time on the improvement of Irish land under conditions which would make life one long struggle against perpetually recurring fraud and falsehood.

Again, however, let me acknowledge another most important endeavour which the Bill makes to provide for a better future. It provides that where all the improvements on a farm have been executed by the Owner, the Court 'may, if it think fit,' disallow the application of the Tenant to have his rent valued and fixed by the State. But surely this is the very minimum of concession to a principle of fundamental policy and justice. The immense variety of de-

gresses in which Owners have contributed for generations to the value of land—the equal variety of degrees in which Occupiers have been repaid over and over again for any outlay they have made—the certainty that thousands of ‘present’ Tenants have been perfectly able to make their own bargain, and that they ought not to be allowed to reopen it—all indicate that the intervention of the State in the regulation of pre-existing contracts ought to be made as clearly exceptional and temporary as possible.

The objections against the scheme which now goes under the name of the ‘Three F’s’ were urged and vindicated with the same force by the same Minister during the debates of 1870. These objections have never been met or answered. The Bill does not adopt that scheme in its entirety. But the differences between it and the general result or the inevitable consequences of the scheme before us, are differences which, though by no means unimportant in theory, are but too likely to yield to pressure. Practically, every ‘present’ Tenant will have the power of bestowing the ‘Three F’s’ upon himself by the simple process of appealing to a Court. The risk he runs of possibly having to pay a somewhat increased rent, and of having that rent liable to periodical revision every fifteen years—this risk is the only deterrent. But this risk is small. The Court is bound to protect his new saleable interest; and the value and amount of that saleable interest will tend more and more to be measured by the cheapness of rent which he may have long enjoyed. Instead, therefore, of the Owner’s theoretical right to increments of rent being available to check the swellings of tenant-right, it is much more probable that the statutory right of sale will, on the contrary, be effectual to check and ultimately to extinguish the right of Owners to enjoy any appreciable share in the increasing value of their own land. An Owner will only be able to increase his rent by paying for it its full capital value.

I must add a few words on the position into which we have come in respect to the whole of this Irish land question.

In the first place, no member of the present Government came into office pledged directly or indirectly to a new Irish Land Bill of this kind. On the contrary, such pledges as were given during the General Election were pledges pointing to measures in other fields of legislation which have all been interrupted, postponed, and perhaps endangered by the Irish land agitation. It was, indeed, universally expected that we should remedy the admitted failure of the Purchase Clauses of the Act of 1870. But neither Mr. Gladstone, nor any of us, were pledged or expected to unsettle all that had been done by that Act in respect to the relations between Ownership and Occupancy.

It was justly expected of us that we should take steps to extend Ownership, and this, too, by some measure of large proportions.

Nobody expected us to break it down by depriving it of all freedom of action, and of all discretion, in the management of property.

Suddenly the accumulated effects of three disastrous seasons brought extensive distress among the cottier tenantry of the West, and simultaneously an active organisation, aiming at the severance of the Kingdoms, was established to take advantage of that distress for its own purposes.

The proposal of the Disturbance Bill last session, to meet a local and temporary emergency, the failure of that Bill, and the speeches made upon it on both sides, tended to reopen many questions.

Under the pressure of this combination of circumstances, the Government agreed to appoint a Royal Commission to inquire into the operation of the Act of 1870.

It was our duty to be open to conviction on this subject. But there was no adverse presumption against the Act of 1870 because three bad harvests had brought distress and even want on the poor and crowded tenantry of the west of Ireland. Mr. Bright has lately addressed some excellent good sense to men who have been agitating for a revival of the fallacies of Protection. He has told them that we have all been suffering of late—manufacturers and agriculturists alike—from too little sun and too much water. Impatience under distress may be the means of disclosing real evils. But it is much more liable to suggest quack remedies.

We waited for the results of the inquiry of our Commission. What have they been? One result has been what Mr. Gladstone calls a 'litter' of Reports. I venture to add that if the Reports have been a 'litter' the examination has been a mess.

In the first place, I think we have good reason to complain of the manner in which the inquiry was conducted. It is not a gracious task to make any such complaint. Men who give their time, at the request of the Government, to conduct a great public inquiry, are not to be lightly criticised. But, on the other hand, interests of the highest importance to the future of Ireland, and to the right understanding of a great question, must not be compromised. I am bound to say, therefore, that the inquiry of the Bessborough Commission was so conducted by some of its principal members as to give the impression that it aimed from the very outset—not so much at an impartial investigation of facts, as—at the establishment of a foregone conclusion. The programme of the 'Three F's' was the programme of the Commissioners who chiefly conducted the examination of the witnesses. This is especially true of Baron Dowse. Leading questions suggested this programme on all occasions. The doctrine that the Ownership of land ought to be reduced to the ownership of a rent-charge was effusively patronised and encouraged. The examination of the very first witness is an excellent example. That witness was one of the County Court Judges, Mr. Thomas De Moleyns, Q.C. This gentleman

had been the County Court Judge for the county of Kilkenny for nineteen years. His experience, therefore, extended over the whole time since the Land Act of 1870 came into operation. Kilkenny has not the enormous area of some of the Irish counties in the mountainous districts of the West. But it is one of the largest and most important counties in the great Province of Leinster. Its population is over 100,000, and the number of its agricultural holdings is between 12,000 and 13,000. Out of this great mass of small holdings, averaging somewhere about 30 acres of arable land, how many cases of 'disturbance' had come before the judge? Not more than sixteen during the whole ten years since the Land Act had passed! And of these how many cases could be called harsh on the part of the landlords? Only perhaps one or two, and of these again were there any in respect of which the judge was unable under that Act to give adequate compensation? Not one! 'I have never met with a case where I have given the full amount I had the privilege of giving.'² Then there is another question not less important. The Land Act of 1870 did not contemplate the regulation of rents by the State. But indirectly and in extreme cases it did authorise the judges to take notice of rents obviously exorbitant. Had any such cases come under the notice of the judge? Not one.³ 'I am not aware that I have had any case of the kind.' Now it is to this witness that Baron Dowse puts the following question—in comment upon the fact stated by Mr. De Moleyns that no custom similar to the Ulster custom (of sale) existed in Kilkenny.⁴ 'Do you think it an advantage or otherwise to have different land laws prevailing in different parts of Ireland?'

This is obviously a leading question to draw from the witness an opinion in favour of the scheme of extending the Ulster custom (or the essential part of it) to the whole of Ireland. And what a question! Is it possible to pack more fallacies into a few words than are packed into that question? To most men it appears obvious that the same land laws do 'prevail over the whole of Ireland,' when those laws aim at securing to all men in each locality that which they may have there lawfully and equitably acquired. But the learned Baron's idea of identity in Land Law seems to be that the same rights should be given to men in one part of Ireland where these men have never possessed them, as are justly recognised as belonging to other men in other parts of Ireland, where these other men have paid largely to acquire them! Mr. Gladstone put this idea in its true light with admirable clearness in his speech of March 11, 1870: 'We distinctly decline to admit that it would be giving one law in substance to Ireland, though it might be so in form, if we were to provide the same legislation and the same compensation for men who have paid nothing at all when they took their holdings as we provide for those who have

² Bessborough Commission Report, vol. ii. Q. 19.

³ *Ibid.* Q. 42.

⁴ *Ibid.* Q. 64.

invested large sums of money; and upon that subject we cannot be too explicitly understood by the hon. member for Kilkenny.' But a very able lawyer like Baron Dowse has the power of bamboozling almost any witness by leading questions such as that above quoted. Even Queen's Counsel seem unable to resist him. Accordingly Mr. De Moleyns was led into some very ambiguous and not very clear-headed replies, until at last, finding himself in deep waters on the whole subject of the Ulster Custom, of which he had no special knowledge, he sounded a very wise retreat: 'I really would wish this part of my evidence, *which I have been more or less drawn into*, to be taken with this qualification, that I do not consider myself a judge.'⁵ Now this is a sample of the method in which the whole examination of witnesses was conducted, and we can imagine its effect on men even less able than Mr. De Moleyns to resist or to detect the fallacies and confusions of thought which are so prevalent on a difficult and complicated subject.

But this is not all.

If the Government were to be accused of seeking to legislate on the Irish Land question on the principle of simply yielding to the demands of those who happen to be tenants at the present moment, without any regard to the possibility of those demands being of any value to tenants of the future, and without any regard to the permanent interests of agriculture as a business, such an accusation would justly have been repudiated as a calumny. Yet in the very first day's proceedings of the Commission we have this principle of legislation not obscurely indicated by Baron Dowse. The high prices charged for tenant-right, under the pressure of open competition, are among the facts which prove that the price payable in Ireland for the hire of land cannot, in the long run, be abated by legislation, and that 'free sale' would simply result in giving to those now in possession a statutory interest in the property of others for which all future tenants must pay the highest competitive prices. As a matter of fact, where free sale has been established by custom, the price of the Occupancy of a farm often exceeds the price of the Ownership, and the result is that it becomes as difficult to acquire the goodwill of a farm as to acquire the fee-simple of it. This consequence is brought out by a question put by the O'Connor Don. In reply to it Baron Dowse makes the following observation:—'What we have to deal with is the condition of the people who are already in possession, not with that of those who are not in possession, but who may be desirous of becoming so in the future.'⁶

The plain meaning of this doctrine is, 'Satisfy existing clamour, and never mind the future.' It is indeed evident that this idea is unconsciously at the bottom of half the recommendations which are popular. But it is rare to find it so candidly avowed.

⁵ Bessborough Commission Report, vol. ii. Q. 337.

⁶ *Ibid.* Q. 141.

There is another remarkable feature of the mode in which the inquiry of the Commission was conducted. Whilst every tenant in Ireland was invited to tell his own story about the dearness of his own rent, the value of his own improvements, and the injustice of increments of rent charged upon them, no adequate attempt seems to have been made by the Commission to test these statements by careful and competent inquiry on the spot. The only substitute for this indispensable work has been the mere transmission of the evidence so given to certain owners and agents whose conduct was inculpated. But this is no real equivalent for a testing inquiry into leading cases. Those who read the principal evidence may never read the rebutting evidence. Thus allegations which are shown to have been utterly false and slanderous are widely spread—affect insensibly the opinions of men,—and are made the basis for legislative proposals, whilst the contradictions, although circumstantial and conclusive, are left unsupported by an independent examination.

Setting aside, however, the method in which the inquiry has been conducted, and looking at the result of the evidence alone, the following points seem to me to be established :—

1. That the larger estates of Irish landowners have been and still are the great and only agencies which have modified and abated the extreme prices arising out of an unhealthy competition for land in Ireland among tenants accustomed to a very low standard of living.

2. That the rules and regulations of management which have been established upon such estates have hitherto been the only barriers, over a large part of Ireland, against the revival and aggravation of the worst evils of the cottier holdings (such as sub-letting and sub-division) among an ignorant and indigent population.

3. That these evils are so connected with the inveterate habits of the people that they can only be prevented by the vigilance of ownership, and by the ultimate right of the Owner to replace a bad Tenant by a good one.

4. That the new landowners, who have bought in the Encumbered Estates Court, or have otherwise recently acquired, property in Ireland, are very often the most active and improving landlords in the country, and that their improvements have only been effected and can only be continued by the use of all that remains of freedom in dealing with the management of land.

5. That the Land Act of 1870 has completely succeeded in giving all needful security to Tenants for *bonâ fide* improvements, and has only disappointed those who expected and who attempted to found upon its provisions exaggerated and even fraudulent charges. It is proved that these charges have often been thirty and forty times more than was just.

6. That there has been a total failure to show that exorbitant increments of rent have been (except in the rarest cases) demanded for

farms in Ireland, or any increments at all at unduly short intervals of time. In ninety-nine cases out of a hundred in which this allegation has been made, the facts even as stated by the witnesses do not support it. The increments complained of are frequently after intervals of twenty, thirty, and even sixty years.

7. That in Ulster the right of the Owner to periodical increments of rent has not been eating up the value of the tenant-right (Questions 4480-81); but that, on the contrary, the demands of tenant-right have a marked tendency to eat up the owner's right to share in the increasing value of his own land, which is his capital.⁷

8. That the right of selling the Occupancy of holdings can work with justice only where it is the result of agreement or of custom, and where the respective shares of the Owner and the Occupier have come, in consequence, to be self-adjusted; and that even under these conditions it tends to absolve and discourage the Owner from spending any part of the income of his land upon the improvement of it.

9. That no appreciable number of evictions has taken place in Ireland since the passing of the Act of 1870, which, with the least reason, can be called 'capricious.' That they have been almost always evictions arising out of the non-payment of rent and out of the incapacity of the Tenant to cultivate the land with any advantage to himself or to the Owner or to the State, or out of the necessity of some removals where holdings are to be improved.

10. That a very large proportion of the smaller Tenants have come to be deeply in debt to money-lenders; that the evil is increasing; and that in this way any new pecuniary interests, artificially and gratuitously bestowed upon them, have already been, and will again be, discounted without the least benefit to Occupiers as a class, or to agriculture as an industry.

11. That the want of more definite security of tenure in Ireland is largely if not mainly due to the unwillingness of the Tenants themselves to accept or submit to reasonable leases.

For these and many other reasons which cannot be stated fully here, I come to the following conclusions:—

1. That the head and front of the new Land Bill ought to have

⁷ The evidence here referred to is so remarkable that it may be well to quote it. Mr. Samuel C. McElroy, who represents the County Antrim Central Tenants' Right Association and the Route Tenants' Defence Association, is asked, 'Do you find that the average selling price of holdings has been smaller during the last ten years?' His reply is, 'No, not smaller.' He is asked again, 'Or even during the latter part of the past ten years?' He replies, 'No; the prices are nothing smaller. Tenant right has increased in value during the last fifteen years.' On the other hand, the evidence is abundant that the sense of ownership to which the right of sale gives rise among the Ulster Tenants is developing rapidly into a denial of the landlords' right to increment of rent even at the longest and most reasonable intervals. Numerous witnesses lay down the doctrine that every shilling added to rent is a deduction of twenty shillings from the selling price, which, they say, belongs to the occupier.

been the provisions for the easy and extensive acquisition of Ownership in land in Ireland. I attach no paramount importance to the many arguments which have been and may be brought against the State buying and dealing in land. It is avowedly an exceptional operation. It is, of course, open to many objections. It involves some evils—even perhaps some risks and dangers. There will certainly be many failures. But there is an immense object to be gained, and that object is the establishment of a more numerous, and of a more indigenuous, body of landowners in Ireland.

2. That all Owners, whether new or old, should be left all the remaining powers of dealing with their land which are consistent with other existing interests legally or equitably acquired and ascertained in each individual case; and that all the new Owners by purchase whose land will more frequently be free from such pre-existing interests, should have complete liberty to deal with it by contract, subject only to such conditions as may be deemed necessary for the successful prosecution of agriculture as an industry.

3. That any legislation which tends further to limit that freedom, or to confuse and confound the rights and duties of those who own and of those who hire land, is injurious and retrograde legislation.

4. That the indelible right of sale, artificially, indiscriminately, and gratuitously attached to every Occupier, is the very heart and centre of all the doctrines and of all the habits that tend to make this confusion worse confounded.

5. That, nevertheless, in view of the unfortunate past history of land tenure in Ireland, and the chaos of opinion which prevails in consequence, it is legitimate and expedient that the State should offer the means of judicial arbitration in all cases in which both Owner and Occupier desire to have recourse to it.

6. That, also, in consideration of the same exceptional circumstances, this right of appealing to a Court may be given, for a time at least, to one party alone, where exceptional poverty and weakness justify some unusual and temporary protection. This was the principle adopted or the idea embodied in the Act of 1870, and it is a reasonable principle under the circumstances of the case.

7. That all decisions so arrived at should have the effect of holding good for a definite time, and thus constituting all or some of the conditions of a lease. Increments of rent at frequent or at uncertain intervals are a great evil. But it is not an evil which has been shown to prevail at all extensively, or against which violent remedies are required. That the acceptance by a Tenant of an increased rent should constitute a lease for a definite term is not an unreasonable provision, where it is really necessary to interfere at all.

8. That the State, in assuming such powers, should assume also the duty of seeing that its decisions are respected; and therefore that rents and other conditions so determined should be enforced by

the authority which imposes them, or by processes of a nature to be as much as possible beyond the reach of political agitation.

These conclusions are consistent with portions—with large portions—of the Bill. But they cannot be reconciled with other portions of it which seem to me not only to go far beyond the necessities of the case, but to establish new principles injurious to the extended Ownership which we are desirous of establishing. I fear that under this Bill much of the land in Ireland will be placed in the position described by The O'Connor Don in his report: 'The Owner would be deprived of the real position of Owner, whilst the Occupier would not have gained that position. The magic influence of Ownership would be taken away from both parties; no one would feel that he was Owner, and one of the strongest incentives to exertion would be done away with.' I fear that the general effect of the proposals now made will be to discourage all expenditure of Owners' capital on the improvement of land in existing and even in future tenancies in Ireland. The only hope of escape from the mischiefs of such a system is that under the Purchase Clauses the number of Owners may some day—and the sooner that day comes the better—be so numerous in Ireland that they will rebel against the irrational and injurious restrictions which are now to be placed on the kind of property they acquire. Truths which are sacrificed for the moment, under the pressure of political emergency, will perhaps be recognised at last, when they have come to 'enter in at lowly doors.'

ARGYLL.

THE
NINETEENTH
CENTURY.

— — —
No. LII.—JUNE 1881.
— — —

*A CIVILIAN'S
ANSWER TO SIR GARNET WOLSELEY.*

‘In the multitude of counsellors there is safety,’ says the wise king, and, if the rule be without exception, the British army is indeed beyond the reach of peril.

Despite, however, the undeniable authority of the proverb, there is perhaps some reason to doubt the soundness of the conclusion. There are certainly many who are of opinion that, notwithstanding the number and variety of the suggestions that have been made for its improvement, notwithstanding the exhaustive reports that have been furnished as to its condition, the safety of that time-honoured institution is anything but assured.

And yet to those who read the recently published report of Lord Airey’s commission, side by side with the speech of the Secretary for War on introducing his new scheme, it did seem as if a time had at last come when diversity of views had for once disappeared, and that, for a short period at any rate, our military chiefs and their civil coadjutors were about to dwell together in harmony.

From the report one thing at least was plain—namely, that the enormous majority of combatant officers believed the system as existing at present to be intolerable; and in the speech signs were not wanting that Pall Mall was of the same opinion as Whitehall.

So novel and satisfactory a conjunction of views could not fail to be gratifying to those outsiders who had so long contemplated

with sorrow and amazement the results of each successive 'army reform.'

How rudely this pleasant picture has been shattered by the appearance of Sir Garnet Wolseley's recent article in the *Nineteenth Century*, it is easy to imagine. So far from being dissatisfied with existing arrangements, we find one of our most experienced and most brilliant officers devoting his facile pen to the task of showing that the system, which so many hoped was about to disappear, is in reality a useful, a well-designed, and a practical method of providing for the defence of the nation; and that to depart from it can only be the work of prejudice or ignorance.

It is intended in this paper to suggest some reasons why the public should in this case accept the view of the great majority of the army as against that of one of its members, accomplished soldier and clever *littérateur* though he be.

It is intended at any rate to enforce this conclusion, that whatever may have been the faults of the systems which preceded it, whatever may be the merits of plans which it is proposed to substitute for it, the present organisation is, to all intents and purposes, an absolute and disastrous failure.

It may seem somewhat presumptuous for a civilian to enter upon the discussion of army matters with a military man, especially when his opponent is an officer of such great and well-deserved reputation as Sir Garnet Wolseley. But a not unnatural diffidence upon this subject is to some extent dispelled by the words of the gallant writer himself. It would doubtless be eminently desirable that some soldier of high standing and wide experience should take up the cudgels in favour of a reform which, it is well known, is almost universally desired throughout the army. But, unfortunately, Sir Garnet Wolseley has so effectually ruled out of court all those of his own cloth, that it seems reasonable that one of that large body of civilians, to whose intelligence he pays a graceful if indirect compliment, should enter the lists.

It is of course unfortunate that our officers—especially 'those of the old school'—are 'prejudiced in so unreasoning a manner that they combine to condemn a system of which a large proportion of them know scarcely anything.' It is to be regretted that the 'young gentlemen joining a regiment adopt unhesitatingly and in an unquestioning spirit' the opinion of their seniors. But, if it be the fact, it is plain that no contribution on the other side of the question from a military writer could be of much value except as representing prejudice and ignorance.

However this may be, it is at any rate somewhat hard to lay down as a general proposition that 'it is an article of the British soldier's faith to look to the authorities of the Horse Guards as his

natural protectors, whilst he regards the War Department officials as his enemies.'

It is perfectly true that a large number of officers disapproved of the short service reforms which emanated from the War Office. It is equally true, however, that a very large number of them hailed with satisfaction the recent proposals which have been made by Mr. Childers, and have only complained that they do not go far enough. It is plain, therefore, that there is a method in their madness; and that if they distrust the War Office it is because the Department in Pall Mall has been responsible for changes of which they distinctly disapproved, and not from any blind prejudice against the Department as such.

It is not uncommon to hear those who defend Lord Cardwell's short service scheme assert that in fact it has never had fair play, and that any shortcomings which may appear in our present organisation are due, not to the imperfections of the plan, but to the defective way in which it has been worked. It may be said that Sir Garnet Wolseley is one of this number, and that the short service system which he defends is some unknown quantity, made up of what the present system ought to be and what he wishes it were. If that be so, there is, of course, nothing more to be said; there are probably a good many other ideal systems which, never having passed out of the region of thought, are not likely, for the present at any rate, to be of much service for the defence of the country. But it is evident that Sir Garnet Wolseley is not content to figure as the champion of our system as it might have been; for the greater part of his article is devoted to defending it as it is.

To one part of the working of our present arrangements Sir Garnet frankly does object, and, in justice to his argument, this objection should be stated as early as possible, in order to give it due weight, and in order to enable us to judge how far the removal of this particular fault would affect the other shortcomings to which we shall shortly refer.

Sir Garnet Wolseley speaks out very plainly upon what he considers to be the inadequate amount of work done by our regimental officers; and there can be no doubt that the requirements of modern warfare do demand closer application and more complete knowledge than have hitherto been considered necessary. Before, however, we accept the suggestion that our officers dislike the present system on the ground that it gives them too much work, and before we commit ourselves to the conclusion that there is no remedy, short of demanding from them the same sort of attention which a Prussian officer gives to his company, two points should be considered. In the first place, in justice to our own captains and subalterns, it should

be said that they are just as often idle because they have no men to instruct, as from any disinclination to work. And, in the second place, it is most important to bear in mind that as our rank and file are recruited on a different system from that of other armies, so our officers serve on conditions which have no parallel elsewhere. An officer, like any other member of the community, must receive some consideration for his services. This consideration may take many forms. In the case of the British officer it takes the form of social position and a certain amount of freedom; it is emphatically not of a pecuniary nature. Practically, an officer does not, and indeed it is hardly contemplated that he should, live upon his pay. Turn his work into drudgery, deprive him of his freedom, and you take away from him the main inducements which he now has to serve his country for nothing. It may be, of course, that even under these strict conditions our officers may be willing to show by their sacrifices another proof of the military spirit which has always animated them. But it is hardly a thing that can be safely counted upon. It is no answer to say that in Germany the career of an officer is as honourable, though far more arduous than it is here. In the first place, in Germany military service is an aid to civil advancement, instead of being, as with us, a heavy drag. Again, the style of living on the Continent is such that military pay is far more nearly equivalent to an actual livelihood than it is here. And, lastly, it is more than doubtful whether the class from which we draw our officers has really any parallel in Prussia.

It may be said, and with truth, that all these considerations are beside the mark; that what is wanted is men who will work hard, and work under prescribed conditions; and that if the present holders of commissions are not prepared to render their services on those terms they should be replaced by others who will do so. This is a very strong argument, and possibly unanswerable; only it is as well to bear in mind what the change may involve. A captain, like a carpenter, must be paid in some way. He may take prestige and position instead of cash, but most assuredly he will not be content without either the one or the other.

But apart from this need for reform, Sir Garnet Wolseley sees much in our present organisation to rejoice at. Let us therefore note what are the circumstances which give him so much satisfaction, and inquire how far they commend themselves to those who are not committed to the merits of any particular set of principles.

And here we may pause for a moment to call to mind what are the points of real interest to a civilian, what are the essentials which he demands, and what are the failings which he cannot pardon.

In the first place be it remembered that the country pays at this moment for its military forces an annual sum of nearly 25,000,000*l.*¹ For this sum it naturally desires to obtain a force which shall be as near perfection as possible, which shall be able to fight its battles abroad, and defend its liberties at home. As to the nature and composition of the force which will best satisfy these requirements, the people of England have always shown themselves careless to a degree most surprising in a nation so imbued with the military instinct, and at the same time so jealous in controlling its own affairs. For many years past the organisation of the army has been left more entirely in the hands of those technically responsible for it than that of any other branch of the public service. The public have hoped, with a confidence as amazing as it was complete, that everything would be done for the best if only they would provide the money necessary for the undertaking. This being so, we must put ourselves in the position of the great mass of Englishmen, and, demanding only the amount of efficiency above referred to, consult those who regulate our military matters as to the best way of obtaining it.

It is fair then to follow Sir Garnet Wolseley's advice, and turn to the proposals which Lord Cardwell himself brought forward, and to the various suggestions to which they gave rise, all, we may presume, made with the hope of remedying existing evils, and of supplying a sufficient and serviceable army in the future.

Foremost among the benefits which the short service system was to secure for us was the formation of two army corps, the regiments composing which were to be kept up to a war footing, or very near it, and which were to be ready at a moment's notice to undertake duty in any part of the world.² Nothing could look better on paper than these compact little armies of 37,000 men apiece always ready to bear the brunt of the first attack, and to give us time to complete and strengthen the weaker regiments which remained. What, however, would have been the result had a sudden emergency arisen to put the efficiency of these arrangements to the test?

The following figures, which are given at page 471 of the Blue Book, form an instructive answer:—

¹ I include the approximate cost of the British troops in India, who, although not paid for out of the home revenues, are in fact a portion of the home army.

² I am aware that in the original scheme the two complete army corps were not an essential feature. In the Commander-in-Chief's minute and the report upon it, published in 1872, the state of preparedness is made to apply to the first thirty-six regiments on the roster, of which half were to be maintained at a strength of 820, and the remainder at a strength of 700 each. The division into corps adopted in the *Army List*, however, naturally led to the idea of maintaining one, and eventually two such divisions in a state to take the field at the earliest opportunity. This intention seems to have been recognised in the compilation given at page 471 of the report of Lord Airey's commission.

FIRST ARMY CORPS.

	Men	Horses	Guns	Wagons
Establishment for field service	37,013	12,597	90	1,631
Actual strength	20,852	4,789	90	241
Required to complete	16,161	7,808	—	1,387
<i>How to be supplied :—</i>				
From army reserve	7,513	—	—	—
From militia reserve	4,822	—	—	—
Drafts from other corps	3,130	2,378	—	—
By enlistment, requisition, or otherwise	696	667	—	1,387
To be purchased	—	4,763	—	—
Total	16,161	7,808	—	1,387

SECOND ARMY CORPS.

	Men	Horses	Guns	Wagons
Establishment for field service	37,013	12,597	90	1,631
Actual strength	16,829	4,155	90	173
Required to complete	20,184	8,442	—	1,458
<i>How to be supplied :—</i>				
From army reserve	8,274	—	—	—
From militia reserve	8,138	—	—	—
Drafts from other corps	2,325	596	—	—
By enlistment, requisition, or otherwise	1,117	—	—	1,158
To be purchased	—	7,846	—	—
Total	20,181	8,442	—	1,458

These, be it remembered, are the divisions of the army whose motto is supposed to be ‘Semper paratus.’ Let us see how the other divisions would fare. Supposing the various processes indicated in the above table as being necessary had been safely gone through and a respectable contingent were able to take the field, there would then remain the duty of falling back upon our remaining reserves for the double purpose of keeping the two first corps up to their proper strength, and of filling up the enormous gaps in the remaining six of our paper armies. It is interesting to find that for this operation there would be available no less than 363 men of the first class army reserve, or about two men per line battalion, and 12,064 of the militia reserve who may or may not be a trifle better than raw recruits. Side by side with these facts it is instructive to study the calculations which experience has supplied as to the average waste of a battalion in time of war, which is variously estimated at from 40 to 70 per cent.

There may be, and doubtless are, admirable reasons to account for

these deficiencies. But it must not be forgotten that, after all, the formation of an efficient reserve is the very essence of the short service system. But if the assistance we are likely to obtain is no greater than would appear from the latest figures upon the subject, the British public may fairly complain that they have got a scarcely perceptible ‘halfpennyworth of bread to a most intolerable deal of sack.’

Sir Garnet Wolseley tells us that the long service was like

The Bight of Benin,
Whence few come out, though many go in.

The quotation might be applied with still greater propriety to the capacity of the present system for absorbing those who ought to pass through the active army into the reserve. Between 1871 and 1878 no less than 184,110 recruits joined the army, yet at the present time the reserve which these short service men were supposed to feed has not yet reached the modest figure of 20,000 men. Indeed it appears from very careful calculation that even under the most favourable conditions our infantry reserve can *never* exceed 45,000 men. Where are the rest of the recruits who have been enlisted? The facts given under the head of ‘waste’ explain how the deficiency arises, but they do not and cannot supply us with a reason for wishing that so microscopic an addition to our resources should be allowed to continue.

Leaving the subject of the two promised army corps, we come to the linked battalion scheme, which, while it insured the permanent efficiency of the regiments in the field, was to preserve intact the *esprit de corps* and solidarity so characteristic of the regimental system. It is interesting to observe how these arrangements have worked in practice.

There is no soldier’s grievance which comes home so readily to the British public as the complaint that regimental traditions are broken up and ruined by the pernicious plan of drafting men from one corps to another. The hardship and unwisdom of it are so palpable that it is difficult to understand what can be said for a system of which it appears to form so essential a part. That it was a practice widely resorted to was well known and deeply regretted in the army. It was not until the present time that the public had an opportunity of judging to what an extent it prevailed. By a brief calculation from the figures hereafter referred to we find, for instance, that in five regiments which took the field in 1879 no less than 1,414 out of a total strength of 4,435 men were drafted from other battalions. These men, be it remembered, had in all probability never seen their officers till the day of embarkation, and doubtless many of them were

re-transferred as soon as they had learnt to know and trust their leaders during the vicissitudes of a campaign.

As regards the question of age the present condition of our infantry force seems as unsatisfactory as it can possibly be. Every-day experience and scientific opinion unite in regarding a young man under twenty as scarcely formed, and unable, except in rare instances, to bear the hardships of a soldier's life. The report before referred to is instructive on this point. In paragraph 59 we find the opinion of Surgeon-Major Adams formed as the result of the inspection of 25,000 recruits, to the effect that 'it is not only pernicious to the interests of the service, but also cruel, to expect a lad in his "teens" to do the work of a full-grown man.' In the next paragraph we find an extract from Professor Parkes's valuable work on military hygiene, in which he speaks of the immaturity of the recruit of eighteen years of age, and dwells upon the necessity for withholding him from the active duties of a soldier's life till he is at least twenty. It is not necessary to dwell upon these expressions of opinion, nor indeed to supplement them as they might be supplemented by the evidence of almost every witness who was examined. The conclusion which they point to is one which we should all support from our own knowledge. Indeed, Sir Garnet Wolseley himself is fully alive to the evils which attend the employment of very young soldiers; but he seems to derive some comfort from the fact that ten or twenty years ago things were just as bad or even worse than they are now. For the general public who are not concerned about the merits of any system, whether it be old or new, but who simply desire a serviceable army, this is perhaps not much consolation. But, be this as it may, it is not easy to believe that the condition in which regiments took the field formerly was worse than what it appears to be at present; and whether better or worse, the service state of our battalions seems so hopelessly bad that it is hard to conceive of a change which would leave them less efficient than they are. The following are a few statistics as to the condition of the regiments which embarked for active service in Africa in 1879—regiments, be it remembered, which were presumably first on the roster for foreign service, and therefore supposed to be ready to start fully manned and equipped at the shortest notice.

Name of battalion	Total strength	Men under 2 years' service	Men under 12 months' service	Men under 20 years of age	Drafted from other corps	Left behind
21st Regt. (2nd batt.)	888	545	305	119	282	355
58th "	884	285	44	106	197	193
60th " (3rd batt.)	889	218	75	152	215	131
91st "	893	477	260	218	374	179
94th "	881	497	221	193	346	187
Total	4,435	2,022	905	688	1,414	1,045

Sir Garnet appears to attach considerable importance to the fact that the soldiers who followed Wellington in the Peninsula were exceedingly bad characters. So doubtless they were. They may have been brutal, unreasoning, cruel, but the fact remains that, to accept the writer's own quotation, 'they could go anywhere and do anything;' and not only could do so, but did whenever the occasion arose. After all, the first requisites of a soldier are that he should fight well and march well. If he possesses these qualifications, but adds to them others less desirable, so much the worse. But the antithesis which is suggested is neither a fair nor a reasonable one. The choice is not necessarily between immoral soldiers who can march and fight, and young men of exemplary character who cannot march at all, and who are not always able to fight.³

The temper of the age, the general feeling with regard to the conduct of war, and the spread of education are all influences which have been at work during the last sixty years, and which have borne fruit in the army no less than in civil life.

The fact that a recruit is enlisted for ten years instead of six is no reason why we should 'brutalise him and treat him as an unreasoning being;' but it is quite conceivable that it may be a very strong reason why we should expect him to be an experienced and seasoned soldier in the one case and not in the other.

The 'dictum' expressed by Sir Garnet Wolseley to the effect that success in war depends upon the skill of the general and not upon the excellence of the men is barely half the truth. It is something like a truism to say that 'in the Peninsula days, as at present, splendid success was only secured when really able and scientific generals commanded in the field;' and that 'then as now, when incompetence directed our military operations, failure and disgraceful disaster were the result.' But even this statement must be taken subject to important qualifications. In the first place, if we eliminate the phrase 'splendid success' and content ourselves with instances where victory has rewarded our arms even though unattended by great and immediate results, many instances will at once occur in which one part of the proposition at any rate has been falsified. At Albuera, at the Alma, at Inkermann, it was emphatically the good qualities of the soldiers and not the skill of the general which gained the day. And, indeed, in the last instance it is hardly necessary to deny to the heroic defence of the heights of Inkermann a first place not only as regards the valour displayed, but also as regards the importance of the results obtained by it.

In short, the obvious fact is this, that a good general will do best with good troops, and even with bad ones may sometimes achieve success. Good soldiers, on the other hand, will sometimes help an

³ See evidence of Colonels Glyn, Pemberton, and others.

incompetent commander out of a difficulty. But there is no reason at all for permitting any other combination than the first oftener than can be helped. To hold otherwise would simply mean that an economical and well-advised administration would deliberately look for its recruits in the ranks of the halt and the maimed, whose loss would be the least felt by the community, and whose infirmities would present no obstacle to 'a really able and scientific general.'

Sir Garnet Wolseley, in common with some others, seems to be of opinion that the failure is rendered less important by proving that, after all is said and done, things were just as bad twenty or thirty years ago. This form of argument might be relevant in discussing the point as to who was responsible for the greatest amount of failure. But it is not an argument which ought to be addressed to the public, to whom the question of a good or bad army is everything, while that of the merits of this or that reformer is, in comparison, nothing.

That the army which we now possess is not a good one, but on the contrary a very bad one, seems to be the teaching of every line of the recently published report.

One of the greatest difficulties experienced in bringing about any radical or useful reform in army matters is the impossibility of making the public realise the magnitude of the disease. Our troops are so scattered, are so little *en évidence*, that popular attention is never concentrated upon them with the intensity which characterises it in detecting the shortcomings of those branches of the public service which come in contact with men's daily lives.

It requires a catastrophe to convince us that anything is wrong, and even the temporary agitation which some more than usually flagrant collapse creates, subsides almost immediately, and we relapse into our usual happy-go-lucky indifference.

It is most unfortunate that this should be so. It is most unfortunate that an Aldershot field day or review cannot be reproduced once a month in Hyde Park.

It requires no military knowledge, no educated eye, to realise that the little companies which pass in brief array before the saluting point are not, either in numbers or in physique, what a British regiment ought to be. Let any one, fresh from reading Napier's description of our infantry on the field of Albuera, place himself as near as he can to the flagstaff at an Aldershot review. Let him bear in mind the passage that describes how 'nothing could stop that astonishing infantry; no sudden burst of undisciplined valour, no nervous enthusiasm, weakened the stability of their order; their flashing eyes were bent on the dark columns in their front; their measured tread shook the ground;' and then apply it to what he sees. The quotation may

be somewhat fine writing, but no possible adaptation could make it a fair description of some of the battalions which we may see now-a-days.

It would be impertinent as well as useless to venture upon such strictures as these if they were not borne out by the almost universal testimony of every officer whose opinion is recorded in General Airey's report. They are made in no spirit of disparagement of the courage and patriotism of our infantry soldiers, which have been so conspicuously proved of late. The Englishman is still, as he always has been, equal—perhaps more than equal—to men of any other race in fighting power. But it is neither fair nor reasonable to demand that he shall exhibit the high qualities which he possesses under every sort of artificial disadvantage.

It is easy enough to argue that, our army being a voluntary one, it must of necessity differ widely from those of the great continental powers. The fact is beyond dispute, but the inference to be drawn from it is this—that if we hope to hold our own against troops drawn indiscriminately from the manhood and strength of a great nation, we must either appeal to the same sources of strength, or we must be careful to make our artificial blade as keen and as finely tempered as the resources of science and wealth will allow.

Those who are anxious to know how nearly we have approached to that ideal under our present system should carefully study the evidence given before Lord Airey's Commission.

Once more let it be said, Sir Garnet Wolseley's arguments are, as far as the outside public are concerned, beside the mark. The army that won at Salamanca and Talavera may have been a very bad one. The men who enlisted before 1870 may have been very inferior. The collapse in the Crimea may have been very complete. In a word, our army may have been in a very bad way before Lord Cardwell's scheme came into operation. But all these considerations do not touch the real question, which is this: 'Is the condition of things now so much better than it was, that we can or ought to be satisfied with it?' Sir Garnet Wolseley himself gives the answer. We require an efficient reserve of 60,000 men. We have not got it. Going round hat in hand is an objectionable practice. Five regiments could not be put into the field without begging. We ought at any time to be able to put into the field an army of 60,000 men, which should leave behind it a thoroughly efficient reserve of well-trained soldiers of at least equal numbers. If, by superhuman efforts, we got together our 60,000 men, our reserve, it appears, would number 363.

These are the salient facts which strike a civilian. The shortcomings that meet his eye lie on the surface—he who runs may read. The new system was, on its own showing, to have provided us with

certain definite safeguards, and at present these safeguards do not exist.

If indeed, as he suggests, Sir Garnet Wolseley have some new scheme in the background by which all these faults are to be remedied, well and good. But whether it involve long service or short, it is allowable to prophesy that it will commend itself to the public in exact proportion to the extent to which its results differ from those which attend the working of our present system.

H. O. ARNOLD-FORSTER.

A REVISER ON THE NEW REVISION.

IN the following remarks on the revised version of the New Testament it is scarcely necessary to say that I propose to speak only as one of the multitude of readers usually designated as 'the public,' to whose perusal and judgment the work is now at length committed. Although from the commencement a member of one of the Revision Companies,¹ I have no right to speak as from any special knowledge which that position may have given me; for it was a rule acted upon throughout that the work done in the Jerusalem Chamber, as well as the opinions expressed by the members, with the results arrived at, and the grounds on which changes were either made or left unmade, should all be considered 'private and confidential.' This rule was understood to apply to all that took place, and it was carefully observed—except only as regarded such little details as were given each month in some of the newspapers, respecting the days of meeting, the members present, and the passages gone over from time to time.

While this was the case, however, it is equally true that every individual member of the company is left now at liberty, in his private character, to judge and criticise the completed work of the whole body of revisers. The results arrived at were determined by vote, as the preface to the volume now published informs us; no alteration being finally made as against the Authorised Version except by a majority of two to one of the members present. The minority, however, although outvoted, were not supposed to be also silenced for all future time, or prohibited from expressing their dissent or the reasons for it; but, on the contrary, naturally retained their right to do so, on and after the publication of the volume. Of this privilege I propose simply to avail myself; but I shall endeavour of course to guard against any breach of the understanding indicated by the old and familiar words 'private and confidential,' printed upon all the different sections of the work, as they were successively issued for the use of the two companies during the progress of the revision. I have nothing therefore to tell respecting anything said by any one at the meetings, or the numbers of the votes given either for or against any alteration made, or anything of this kind. I have simply to take the work as it is now issued, and, so far as may be practicable within the limited

¹ So called after the example of 1611.

space at my command, to express my own individual judgment on the new text, basing this simply upon such general knowledge of the subject as is familiar, or easily accessible, to every critical student of the New Testament.

The volume which gives occasion to these remarks is a handsome octavo of 594 pages, without counting the Preface or the American Suggestions, which will make up some forty to fifty pages more, according to the size of the edition in which they are printed. The work professes to be 'the version set forth A.D. 1611, compared with the most ancient authorities and revised A.D. 1881.' This latter date might have been more fully given as A.D. 1870 to A.D. 1881, for the task has been close upon eleven years in hand, including the time occupied in printing, having been commenced on the 23rd of June, 1870, and being now published on the 17th of May, 1881. Time enough certainly for its preparation, enough too for no small amount of elaborate over-correction, such as I greatly fear many readers will find in its pages.

The preface forms a very interesting and valuable introduction to the volume, and to this our attention must in the first instance be turned. After giving a brief account of the origin and character of the Authorised Version, the imperfections of which are fully acknowledged, it proceeds to speak of the formation of the two companies for its revision, and of the rules that were laid down for the execution of their undertaking. These were drawn up in May 1870, by a Committee of the Convocation of Canterbury,² and were in sub-

² The following members of Convocation constituted this committee for the New Testament:—Bishops Ellicott, Moberley, and Wilberforce, the Prolocutor Dr. Bickersteth (now Dean of Lichfield), Deans Alford and Stanley, and Canon Blakesley (now Dean of Lincoln). This Committee had authority to invite the co-operation of others 'to whatever nation or religious body they might belong'—a wise and just provision considering the interest which all sects and parties have in the book to be revised. Accordingly, the following were invited to take part in the work:—Dr. Angus (Baptist), Archbishop Trench, Dr. Eadie (Scotch United Presbyterian), Rev. Dr. Hort (of Cambridge), Rev. W. G. Humphry, Professor Kennedy (of Cambridge), Archdeacon Lee, Dr. Lightfoot (now Bishop of Durham), Professor Milligan (Scotch Church), Professor Moulton (Wesleyan Methodist), Dr. J. H. Newman (now Cardinal), Professor Newth (Congregationalist), Dr. A. Roberts (Scotch Church), Dr. Vance Smith (Unitarian), Dean Scott (of Rochester), Dr. Scrivener, Dr. Tregelles (Congregationalist), Dr. C. J. Vaughan (now Dean of Llandaff), Professor Westcott. To these some additions were subsequently made, namely, Bishop Wordsworth (St. Andrews), Dr. D. Brown (Scotch Free Church), Dean Merivale. The last named withdrew from the work before it had made much progress. Dean Alford, Bishop Wilberforce, Dr. Tregelles, and Dr. Eadie all died previous to 1876; and Dr. Newman declined the invitation. On the death of Bishop Wilberforce, his place was taken by Professor (now Archdeacon) Palmer. The number of members has throughout been about twenty-four, of whom the average attendance has been sixteen, during the ten and a half years of working time. The Company has met monthly, under the presidency of Bishop Ellicott, ten times each year, with one or two exceptions only, and has made a total working time of 412 days, of about seven hours each, to say nothing of the time necessarily spent in private study connected with the work. Clearly the revisers deserve a good name for application and industry.

stance as follows: (1) To introduce as few alterations as possible . . . consistently with faithfulness; (2) Alterations to be expressed in the language of the Authorised and earlier English versions; (3) To go twice over the work; (4) The text to be adopted to be that for which the evidence is decidedly preponderating; (5) To make or retain no change on the second or final revision, unless *two-thirds* of those present approved of the same, but on the first revision to decide by simple majorities; (6) Refers only to postponement of a decision in certain cases; (7) To revise the headings of chapters and pages, paragraphs, italics, and punctuation; (8) When considered desirable, to refer to others not in the Company for their opinions. (It does not appear from the preface that this last rule has ever been acted upon.)

In these rules two features are very prominent: first, the extreme care for the Authorised, which was not to be altered except by a vote of two to one of the members present from time to time; secondly, the great care as to the style, that is to say, the words, in which alterations were to be made; for these were to be limited, as far as possible, 'to the language of the Authorised and earlier English versions.' These two rules should have been sufficient, if known, to allay the apprehensions of some notable opponents of the project of revision, one of whom spoke of the revising process as if it were the same as putting the Bible into a crucible and recasting it; or again, as laying it on the table of the anatomist and dissecting it. Archbishop Thomson was reported in the papers of the day to have expressed himself to this effect in his speech against revision in the York Convocation. He thus spoke much as if he were not aware that honest men who did not deliberately intend to misrepresent their original would be guided by the laws of the language from which they were translating; or as if he thought that a body of men appointed to the work, such as the Westminster revisers, were likely to corrupt or mutilate the English Bible under the pretence of removing its manifold and everywhere admitted imperfections. The Earl of Shaftesbury in a letter to the *Times* expressed himself with equal disfavour or hostility to the work. A revision of the Bible, he feared, would dilute and lower its style, would modernise and Frenchify it. Such anticipations were perhaps excusable on the part of a layman who may be supposed to be but slightly acquainted with the nature of the work to be executed. But they were not to be expected from a man professedly learned in the Scriptures, although I am half inclined to confess that in several respects the results which have been arrived at in the volume as now published go some way, if not to justify, at least to illustrate the doubts and fears of those who were against revision. But yet it will be seen on consideration that the adverse anticipations alluded to could not, by the nature of the case, be largely fulfilled. The rules just cited show at least that they

ought not to have been fulfilled in any serious degree. Perhaps I ought to add that the two eminent opponents before named, if they had supported the project of revision instead of opposing it, might possibly have exercised a salutary influence upon the work and prevented some of the more objectionable changes, of which I shall have to speak in the course of this paper.

It is singular at all events, and worth noting, that gentlemen could be found, who, while professing to receive the Bible as the 'inspired Word,' the very 'Word of God,' could yet be satisfied to go on placing it before the world, in tens of thousands of copies annually, in an imperfect form, with all its well-known false readings and errors of translation. It would almost appear that they looked upon the English version, errors and all, as 'given by inspiration of God,' for on what other principle could they rationally object to its correction at the hands of earnest, religious, and competent men—and surely no others were likely to undertake such a task?

The fourth of the above rules was one of primary importance. 'The text to be adopted,' that is to say, the Greek text to be followed, was to be that for which there was 'preponderating evidence.' This meant, in effect, that the revisers were to form their own 'text' as they went on, judging according to the evidence of the 'readings' that offered themselves. This was the only rule that could be laid down in such a case. It would indeed have been easier at once to adopt a critical text, as that of Griesbach, Tischendorf, or Tregelles, and relying upon the judgment of the editor to have followed him implicitly, without further investigation. But to do this would have been to attribute to any text so adopted a degree of authority which it might not deserve. Even the best of editors—with all reverence be it said!—is not infallible. Griesbach is, indeed, one to be most highly esteemed for breadth of knowledge and soundness of judgment, but he had not in his hands all the materials possessed by later scholars; and Griesbach's theory of recensions tended sometimes to lead him astray. A similar remark applies more or less, *mutatis mutandis*, to any other critical authority that might be named; and so it remained for the revisers to look at the various readings for themselves, to estimate their value in their own way, and to follow their own judgment. This it will no doubt be found that they have done carefully, and with sound results. But the task entailed labour, and would take much time; not so much perhaps as might be thought at first sight, at least by ordinary readers. For the materials for judging of the comparative value of readings have been wonderfully brought together, simplified, and systematised by the careful labours of the last hundred years in this department of learning. Almost every various reading of any importance in the Greek manuscripts, as well as in the ancient versions and the quotations so largely made by the Church fathers, has been noted

and set down at its proper place in the great editions, so as to enable a modern critic to judge for himself as to the originality of the text in any given case.

Such being the fact, the labours of the revisers in this part of their work were greatly lightened and simplified. Indeed, it will be found that alterations in the English translation rendered necessary by change of text in the original are comparatively few. Moreover, it must be said that, numerous as are the differences of readings found in the manuscripts as compared with each other, they are commonly of very small importance in point of meaning. In multitudes of cases they are so trivial as to be scarcely capable of exact expression in a simple English rendering, or they are scarcely worth expressing. And so it results that alterations in the English version of an important character, arising from difference of original reading, will not exceed a few dozens in number. The great mass of changes will be found to consist of corrected and closer renderings of the old Greek text—the *Textus Receptus*. Thus it further appears, that the terms in which critical works are apt to speak of different ‘texts,’ and ‘readings,’ and ‘types of text,’ are a little misleading. Differences there are, no doubt; and there are manuscripts which run together in groups—some exemplifying one class of differences, while others agree in exemplifying another—the standard of comparison being the *Textus Receptus*. But such differences after all are, as just said, but slight; insomuch that the reader who has only the old Greek text in his hands is in possession, through that, of every substantial statement and doctrine of the New Testament. This fact is too apt to be lost sight of; but it is worth remembering, although it by no means justifies the opposition to revision that was raised in certain influential quarters; nor indeed was this the *ground* on which opponents professed to stand in speaking as they did. They have to their credit, so far as appears, nothing but a blind impulse of opposition to change, through fear of changing for the worse, although all the probabilities of the case so plainly lay in the contrary direction.

It was no part of the duty of the revisers, however, to form a *new* Greek text, nor have they, as the Preface is careful to note, attempted anything so considerable. But something very like this has been done, nevertheless, as the result or accompaniment of their labours. For it is announced by the University Presses that an edition of the Greek text is to be at once published, incorporating all the readings followed by the revisers, and giving the displaced readings at the foot of each page. This work is not, however, prepared by the Revision Company itself, but by one or two of their number at the request of and for the University Presses.^a It may be anticipated that this

^a A second work of a similar kind is to be the Greek text used in 1611, with the variations from it given at the foot of the page. This will be edited by Dr. Scrivener; the other by Archdeacon Palmer.

volume will in all important points be in substantial agreement with the text of Tischendorf, or perhaps even more nearly with that of Westcott and Hort. The work will, however, necessarily be inferior in value to that of Tischendorf, inasmuch as it will not furnish the manuscript and other evidence relating to the preferred readings.

The Preface goes on, after stating the rules as above given, to speak of the way in which they have been carried out. 'These rules it has been our endeavour faithfully and consistently to follow.' 'Faithfulness' to the original, it will be remembered, was to be the great and dominating principle; but, consistently with this, the alterations were to be 'as few as possible.' I must frankly say at once, I do not think this fundamental rule has been observed so well as it might have been. The alterations, in my own humble judgment, are not 'as few as possible,' but rather the *contrary*; and in many cases, while minute and literally accurate, they seem to be so in such a way as even to run counter to the very principle of faithfulness to which they ought to have been subordinated. My meaning in this statement will become clear as we proceed.

The character and extent of the revision are indicated by the statement of the Preface itself as to the nature of the alterations which have been made. These are enumerated under five heads:—(1) alterations from change of reading; (2) where the rendering of the Authorised was incorrect; (3) from obscure or ambiguous meanings to others clear and express; (4) alterations for the sake of consistency of rendering, that is, to make words and passages harmonious or parallel in the English which are so in the Greek; (5) alterations by *consequence*, or arising out of changes already made, even though not in strictness required by the general rule of faithfulness. These various grounds, it will be admitted, are just and reasonable in themselves; yet when we come to the details of work in which they are exemplified, too much is found to which exception is to be taken, and probably will be taken, even by the most tolerant and sympathising critic—if a critic, in such a case, can or ought to be tolerant and sympathising.

It will be convenient in what follows, in the first place, to take the order of the Preface in the illustrations which it gives of the mode of proceeding in the different classes of alteration just enumerated. Then, having done this, we may proceed to notice a few of what may be termed the more special and salient features of the new text. The great mass of little changes will necessarily be passed over unnoticed. Most of these will, of course, be found to be rightly and carefully done, although a great proportion of them may be held to have been uncalled for. These will be considered by most readers as mere intruders, breaking in upon the old familiar music of the Authorised, and doing so without any gain of sense by way of compensation—nay, sometimes even with a loss.

In exposition of the method of proceeding we are told, first, that where a word is found to occur in a book with characteristic frequency, care has been taken to render it uniformly, so as to exhibit the characteristic word in *one* way, as far as possible. This was obviously a just principle, too much overlooked by the translators of 1611. It has been duly carried out in some instances, as, for example, in the rendering 'straightway,' a favourite word of the second Gospel. It is much to be wished that the same principle had been equally well remembered in words of greater importance. But of this more shall be said by-and-by.

The rendering of the tenses, we are next informed, has been carefully attended to. The results are not always happy. The Greek aorist is too often represented very baldly, by a correspondent indefinite past—the old and fuller rendering by *have* (which is often quite as correct) being rejected. Thus, Matt. x. 8, 'Freely ye received,' for 'freely ye have received;' Luke xix. 17, 'thou wast found faithful' for 'thou hast been found faithful;' John xvii. 4, 6, 'I glorified thee on the earth,' 'I manifested thy name.' So it is many times through this chapter, and in numerous other cases. In all of them I venture to think the old renderings were mostly preferable, not only in sound, but in aptness to the context and to the general character of the passage. That the old renderings read better probably no one will dispute. The change to a greater formal accuracy is therefore dearly bought, and was in truth not worth the price paid for it. This kind of alteration will often strike the reader, and generally with an unpleasant effect, while yet it may be hoped that it will in time become familiar, and perhaps agreeable.

But more than this: it cannot be doubted that in the use of the tenses in New Testament Greek there is very much of the Hellenistic influence. Men whose native language was so closely akin to the ancient Hebrew, and to whom Greek was only an acquired tongue, would not be likely, ought not to be expected, to have used the varied and copious tenses of the Greek verb with the freedom or accuracy of a Xenophon or a Thucydides. This is abundantly seen in the Septuagint, and also in the Apocrypha; and why should it not appear in the New Testament? The fact is that it is extremely visible and undeniable. The same general cause accounts for many instances of awkwardness of expression, not only in connection with verbal forms, but in the use of other words. It is much to be feared that our revisers have not made due allowance for all this. The consequence is that, with great literalness of rendering, they have not always well brought out the sense, and they have certainly often produced rough and jerky effects, which it would have been better to avoid. This is exemplified in such renderings as Matt. v. 22, 'hell of fire' (of which more hereafter), with which compare Rom. viii. 6, 'mind of the flesh, mind of the spirit,' compared with 'sinful flesh' (v. 3); why not

'flesh of sin' also? So Rom. viii. 21, 'liberty of the glory,' and many similar cases. The clumsiness of such renderings as John iv. 23, 24, will strike most readers. The fault, indeed, here is not from the needless rendering of any Hebraism, so much as from a quite gratuitous literalism, by which nothing in point of sense appears to be gained.

In reference to the rendering of the article similar remarks may be made. As the rule, it is too often expressed. This sometimes injures the idiom of the English, and in truth impairs or misrepresents the force of the original. What, for instance, is gained in Matt. v. 15, 'Neither do men light a lamp and put it under the bushel, but on the stand?' The article is used to generalise as well as to render definite; and it may be so here, as the words are closely connected with a general precept. If so, then *a* is better than *the*, and the change made in the Authorised is uncalled for. In Rom. iii. 27, we have a contrary case, the article left out by Hebraism, but better retained in the English, though absent from the Greek, 'a law of faith.' Here the word exemplifies the common Hebrew usage of the omitted article with a noun which is qualified and rendered definite by another noun, even without any article, as in the two first words of the first Gospel. The over-rendering of which I am now speaking often occurs; thus, Matt. vi. 25, 'Is not the life more than the food, and the body than the raiment?' The sense would have been given by omitting the article rather than retaining it with *food* and *raiment*. So Matt. vii. 24, 25, 'the rock;' 'a rock' is more suitable to English idiom; as in 2 Cor. xii. 12, where the Greek is τὰ μὲν σημεῖα τοῦ ἀποστόλου, rendered 'the signs of an apostle.' Here the generalising force of the article is recognised, and the rendering is correct. In this case, the form followed in Matt. v. 15 and elsewhere would not have been admissible, showing us that the change there was unneeded, and that the Authorised is right.

The worst case of this kind is perhaps in Matt. viii. 12 and the parallel places, 'There shall be the weeping and gnashing of teeth.' The wonder is that, with the strange zeal for literalisms which appears to have animated the revisers, they have not given us here *all* the articles, 'the weeping and the gnashing of the teeth.' This would have been too much; but the rendering followed is almost as unjustifiable. Probably it was adopted because of the reference to the end of the world or age, which some think may be referred to in a previous verse (v. 11). Granting this, still how is this shown by keeping the article before 'weeping'? In truth, the addition only weakens the phrase. 'Weeping and gnashing of teeth' is a terse and idiomatic expression, about the purport of which there can be no mistake, whether it be referred to the second coming of Christ and the last things, or whether it stand alone, without any such reference. 'There shall be the weeping' is poor and feeble in com-

parison. There is, as observed before, too much of this literal accuracy, tending not to strength but to weakness, and, in too many cases, impairing the faithfulness of the English, regarded as the representative of the Greek. Matt. vii. 6 is a bad case of this kind : ‘neither cast your pearls before the swine.’ Are we to suppose that the writer had some definite animals in view, and was speaking, therefore, of *them*? Or is it not that in this precept he simply generalises by means of the article, and so renders his precept in a sense universal in its spirit?

The Preface goes on to speak of the rendering of pronouns. Particular care, it is stated, has been taken in their expression (or non-expression, if absent in the Greek), and in regard to ‘the place they occupy in the sentence.’ This refers to such cases as that in the example last given : ‘cast your pearls.’ The Authorised has : ‘cast ye your pearls.’ But the Greek is without the word ‘ye,’ and so the revisers have left it out! But then it is latent in the verb, and many readers will think that the English sounds better with it, while nothing is gained to the sense by leaving it out. In other cases no doubt the effect is happier, and the correction is rightly made, whether by the omission or the insertion of the pronoun.

The next paragraph relates to the particles, in which ‘uniformity of rendering’ has been carefully observed. But so much as this can scarcely be said in regard to the point following. This is the rendering of the prepositions, of which the familiar *ἐν* may be more especially instanced. In the New Testament this word is constantly used after the manner of Hellenistic Greek, and can only be understood when attention is paid to the way in which the Hebrew Beth is expressed in the Septuagint. It is constantly used of the *instrument*, frequently of the *manner* or accompaniment, and also of the *cause*. The instrumental force of the word the revisers have sometimes recognised and sometimes not, and this quite arbitrarily, for anything that appears. Even where they have recognised it, they have done so apparently without confidence, and have actually given a margin, to inform the reader that the original was *in*, as if there was some mysterious virtue in this little word, which it was feared might be lost, unless it were duly noted that the original meant *in* and not *by*. An early example to this effect may be seen in Matt. iii. 11 : ‘I indeed baptise you *with* water, . . . but he that cometh after me . . . shall baptise you *with* the Holy Ghost.’ The original is *ἐν*, but, as here used, we have it in its usual Hellenistic sense, denoting the instrument or means with which ; and why, therefore, should it not have been so rendered without a comment which tends only to perplex? The rendering in the text is the true sense, here as so often elsewhere. So far as the English is concerned, the marginal *in* would have been simply wrong, and it was needless to say any-

thing about it. I hope, however, that no Baptist friend will take offence at this view of the case!

In some places, however, the original *ἐν* has been retained—that is to say, its English equivalent has been used. The result may speak for itself; we have it, for example, in Heb. i. 1, ‘God, having of old time spoken unto the fathers in the prophets by divers portions and in divers manners, hath at the end of these days spoken unto us in *his* Son:’ ‘in the prophets,’ ‘in *his* Son.’ The word here surely denotes simply the instrumental agency. It can mean nothing else according to the Hellenistic usage, of which the New Testament is so full. The change from the Authorised seems, therefore, to have been quite uncalled for, and the words as they stand tend only to puzzle a reader, imparting also an awkwardness to the passage, which does not appear either in the Greek or in the Authorised. This comes of too great literalness in translating, combined with too great readiness to forget the peculiar character of New Testament Greek. The same idiom occurs in Matt. ix. 34: ‘By the prince of the devils casteth he out devils.’ Here the translation is correct, but it is carefully noted that the original of *by* is *in*. But, if it be so, what else can it *mean*? as, indeed, is seen in Luke xi. 20: ‘If I by the finger of God cast out devils’—literally, ‘*in* the finger of God.’ Is it not inconsistent to omit the margin here, seeing that the use of *in* in this case would appear to be even more singular than in the other, and must there not, therefore, on the principle of literalness, have been some reason for using it? In truth, there is nothing remarkable in such cases. The word occurs quite normally as a usual way of expressing instrumentality, and it could not have been correctly Englished by any other word than *by*. This is recognised in 1 Cor. iv. 21, ‘with a rod;’ but why is the marginal warning inconsistently omitted?

The new rendering of Heb. i. 1 has just been quoted. It will very probably be regarded as one of the least happy passages in the new text. It is extremely literal certainly; but in this lies its fault, while it gives no improvement upon the Authorised in point of sense, none at least that is worth speaking of. The phrase ‘divers portions’ is the only one which conveys a little more of the original meaning than we had before, but the difference is so small that many readers will remain insensible of the gain arising from the disturbance of the old and familiar words. The new fact stated, or intended to be so, is that the communications made by the prophets in old times were not made all at once, but in separate and successive portions. This is little different from what was at least suggested by the ‘sundry times’ now displaced. Again, the words ‘*his* Son’ ought certainly to have been corrected into ‘a Son,’ as in the margin. Former revelations were by prophets, the latter by ‘a Son.’ The Logos in Christ was ‘a Son,’ one of many such according to the philosophical conceptions of the time, and according to the developed

Logos doctrine familiar to Philo a century before the Epistle to the Hebrews was written. So that the Greek here is in harmony with these ideas, which its English representative is not. But modern theology takes a different view of this subject from that which would be familiar to the writer to the Hebrews, and therefore the superfluous *his* of the Authorised is retained. It is much to be wished that more of the passage in its fine old English form had also been retained; for example, not only the preposition *by*, but the old rendering of the verbs, and the words displaced for 'at the end of these days,' which scarcely yield an intelligible sense. In this passage it is too clear that the English reader has lost much and gained little by the revision.

It is unnecessary to speak with equal detail of the particulars enumerated in the remainder of the Preface. The revisers being directed to make their alterations, as far as possible, in the language of the Authorised earlier English versions, have carefully done so, thus preserving uniformity of literary style and colour. Archaisms have been removed, where they seemed to occasion misconception of the meaning; otherwise they have been left. Cases still appear, however, in which an uncouth archaism might better have been changed. The form 'for to' before the infinitive is now only a vulgarism. The form 'to us-ward' seems clumsy. The inversions of words sometimes give strength and variety to expression; in such cases they are rightly left; but there are instances in which they are objectionable in English, and would seem to have come in from the German of Luther, with which our earliest translators were familiar. Such forms as 'then fell she down straightway,' 'neither went I up to Jerusalem,' 'then departed Barnabas for to seek Paul,' are in accordance with a well-known German idiom, but hardly with good English usage in our day. Nor are they pleasant reading.

The marginal notes, we are informed, represent a large amount of careful and elaborate discussion. This will readily be believed. The remark will most probably be made that this part of the work is a little overdone. Marginal notes in particular giving alternative renderings, as well as those giving more exactly the force of the original, are too numerous. The fault is perhaps on the right side; but yet it tends to perplexity when renderings occur even in the margin which really convey little sense in themselves, or when they add nothing that assists the understanding of the text. What, for instance, is the use of the frequent margin 'Or, *in*'? or of this, 'Gr. *before the face of his entering in*' (Acts xiii. 24), the full meaning of the Hebraism being already in the text; or of this, 'Or, *until*,' added to the right rendering 'for a season'? Or of this, 'Gr. *impress*' (Matt. v. 41); or of this, 'Gr. *dig through*' (Matt. vi. 19); or of this, 'Gr. *take alive*' (Luke v. 10); in all these cases the true meaning, the apt and intelligible meaning, being given in the

text. There are multitudes of marginal notes equally trivial and equally useless. On the other hand, there are cases in which a margin would have had great interest and some importance, but it has been omitted. For example, in 1 John v. 7, the spurious words, 'the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one,' are, with the connected words, quietly dropped out of the text, no intimation of this being given to the reader. Of course he can find out the omission for himself, if he should compare the old with the revised version, or if he should remember that the words were there once. But it would seem to have been better work to have given notice that there was here so great a change. This has been done in Mark ix. 44, 46; and it is duly indicated that the concluding verses of the second Gospel are of doubtful authenticity, as well as the section of John, from vii. 53 to viii. 11.

Several other matters of less moment are next referred to, and their treatment explained; namely, the use of italics, the division into paragraphs (the old verse numerals being retained), the mode of printing quotations from the Old Testament, the punctuation, and lastly, the titles of the books. On these it need only be observed that the mode of giving the quotations from the Old Testament does not appear to be a very successful experiment. The printing in parallelisms spoils the uniformity of the page too much, and was not worth adopting, unless the parallelism was a good one. In many of the cases it is very imperfect; and, indeed, passages that are purely prose have been broken up into parallelisms for no other reason apparently except that they are quotations from the Old Testament. It has been overlooked that large portions even of the prophetic books are as prosaic as prose can be.

As to the titles of the books, the revisers have 'deemed it best' to leave them as they were. Perhaps this was unavoidable; but it is a pity nevertheless, for to the common reader a sanction will appear to have been given to statements which, to say the least, are in several cases extremely doubtful, and in some unquestionably wrong. 'The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Hebrews' ought not to have been left; for what manuscript authority has it? And surely a majority of the revisers themselves would not have voted it to be a justifiable addition to the sacred text.

The remainder of this paper may best be occupied with the consideration of a few renderings of special interest and importance in the new text, which may serve too to illustrate and to justify the preceding remarks.

We come at once, on the second page of the volume, to instances which cannot be passed over without critical comment and question. 'Holy Ghost,' Matt. i. 18. On this, the first occurrence of these words, we have a marginal note, 'Or *Holy Spirit*, and so throughout this book.' Such is the usual form of notice to the reader at the

first place in each book where these words are found. But the question is inevitable, Why was not the word 'Spirit' taken into the text and adopted as the rendering of the Greek *πνεῦμα*? It is a good word, of rich and comprehensive import, and it corresponds to the original in a way which cannot be alleged of the term used. The Greek word is found in a multitude of cases standing *alone*, that is, without any connected adjective or equivalent word. In such cases, 'Ghost' cannot be used. Hence the necessity, arising from the use of the latter, of having *two* words in the English version to represent the single word of the original. This consideration itself affords a strong reason against the introduction of the word 'Ghost' at all. For why employ two terms when a single one is sufficient? The one referred to is an impracticable kind of word, and may indeed be said, like many other things, to be growing obsolete, except only in ecclesiastical use.

It will be found, however, that in a few cases in the earlier books as here revised, the Authorised 'Ghost' has been changed into 'Spirit.' On what principle this has been done does not appear; but it would almost seem as if it had been intended to make the change in cases in which *power* or *influence* was supposed to be mainly denoted by *πνεῦμα*, and in others, to which a personal character was presumed to belong, to leave the Authorised as it was. If this were the case, the revisers would seem to have abandoned the task of discriminating between the two significations as beyond their power, or they may have turned from it shocked, perhaps, at the daring of their own hands in making such an attempt. The Authorised, it may be noticed, has the rendering 'Holy Spirit' only in some three instances, so that the translators of 1611 were at least fairly consistent in what they did, which is more than can be said for their successors of 1881. The present revision has kept these three instances, and added to them about half-a-dozen others (as Luke ii. 25, 26, iv. 1; Acts ii. 4, vi. 5). There may be a few more, but nothing is said in the Preface as to why the change was made. Of the three places in which 'Holy Spirit' occurs in the Authorised, and which our revisers have retained, one has been treated in a remarkable way. It is Ephesians iv. 30: 'Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God, whereby ye were sealed unto the day of redemption.' I purposely quote the Authorised, that the proceeding of the revisers here may more clearly appear. It would of course have been intolerable to say 'Holy Ghost' in this case; but yet, while rightly retaining the Authorised 'Spirit,' the revisers have so far departed from it as directly to suggest the personal meaning, by their treatment of the relative pronoun connected with it. They have rendered, 'Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God, in whom ye were sealed.' This, of course, is in harmony with the mode of rendering the preposition *ἐν* followed in other cases, and so often given in the margin, as before pointed out. It is also in

harmony with the established theology on the subject; but it is the exact opposite of the common usage of the revisers in their translation of the relative pronoun personal: 'Our Father *which* art in heaven,' and so in nearly all similar cases, the archaic 'which' being persistently preferred to 'who.' Against this use of 'which' the American revisers remonstrate, the seventh of their suggested corrections being that *who* (or *that*) should everywhere be substituted for it. The old word, however, is not unpleasant to the English ear, and there was no occasion to change, and nothing would be gained by the change, except a certain modernising of the old and well-accepted word. But, if *which* might do for 'Our Father,' why should it not have served for 'Holy Spirit'? why, except more distinctly to suggest what is not in the original, namely that the word *πνεῦμα* has here a personal meaning? I am sorry to ask the question, but it is unavoidable, not only in this case but in others which are related to it. Moreover, as to the words 'in whom ye were sealed,' what do they mean? Have they any intelligible meaning? Can any intelligible meaning be assigned to the Greek, except the obvious instrumental sense so constantly met with? 'Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God by which ye were sealed'—by the reception of which, or the inspiration of which, ye were marked out, set apart, secured as disciples unto the expected day of the second coming. Such is clearly the sense of the verse, but it is missed altogether by the new version.

Returning, however, to the rendering 'Holy Ghost,' it may be observed that the English is perhaps the only existing version of importance in which the word *πνεῦμα* has received a twofold equivalent. It will indeed be said that the two renderings are identical in value. But this is surely not the case. 'Ghost' has far more of the personal force in it than the other, and far more than the original *πνεῦμα*, which indeed is entirely without it, except sometimes in a certain figurative sense. At any rate the words are so different that there are multitudes of instances where *Ghost* cannot be used at all and *Spirit* can. The former can only be written with one particular adjective, and in one single phrase, whereas the word *πνεῦμα*, for which it stands, is used with various adjectives and in all sorts of connections. We can say the Spirit of God, but not the Ghost of God; the Spirit of Christ, but not the Ghost of Christ; the Divine Spirit, the eternal Spirit, the almighty Spirit, but we could not substitute *Ghost* in any such cases, without a shock to the reverent feeling of a reader. It is vain therefore to say that the two words are of identical force and meaning; and it is much to be anticipated that the judgment of the public on this crucial point will fail to recognise in the revisers that judicial freedom from theological bias which was certainly to be expected from them.

The personal turn so gratuitously given to the pronouns in connection with the word 'Spirit' is visible in other instances besides

the one just mentioned. Thus in Rom. viii. 16, the Authorised has 'the Spirit itself beareth witness.' This has been changed into 'the Spirit himself,' although the Greek for the last word is, of course, the neuter pronoun *αὐτό*. In such cases, and there are several of them, the true faithfulness would have been, not only to render by *Spirit* everywhere, but to have kept (or introduced) the neuter pronouns, *it*, *itself*, *which*. I do not indeed deny that a quasi-personality is occasionally attributed to *πνεῦμα*. It is so in Rom. viii. 16, for to bear witness is the act of a personal agent. But the same kind of personality is attributed to charity (love) in 1 Cor. xiii. 4, 5: 'Charity suffereth long and is kind, . . . doth not behave unseemly, seeketh not her own, is not provoked.' But *here* the revisers have not thought it necessary to keep up the personal idea in the pronouns. They have actually changed the Authorised personal pronouns feminine into the corresponding neuters; they have even given us 'seeketh not its own,' instead of a correct rendering of the Greek, 'seeketh not *her* own.' This, we might be ready to believe, has arisen from oversight or accident. But the same kind of change—a change, that is to say, in a certain direction and with a certain visible tendency—occurs in other instances, and it is much to be regretted that this should be the case.

Another example of the same perverse method of proceeding occurs in Matt. i. 21, in the force given to the pronoun *αὐτός*. This word is sometimes used in the New Testament Greek without any special emphasis. Often indeed it means 'himself,' or carries with it some equivalent meaning; but it is used also for 'he' simply, and with no greater force. This is recognised by the revisers in Matt. xii. 50, xvi. 20; Luke v. 17, xix. 2, and in other instances. Has the pronoun any greater or more special force in Matt. i. 21? The Authorised has 'he shall save his people from their sins;' the revised reads, 'it is he that shall save his people,' giving a very special emphasis to the pronoun which was quite adequately expressed by the word 'he.' It must be admitted, however, that the best authorities have taken opposite sides on the question whether *αὐτός* ever occurs in the New Testament with the simpler meaning. This may be so, though it would seem to be strange enough to have a doubt on the point. It is clear, at all events, that the revisers were ready to throw the benefit of the doubt in a particular direction, small as its value is, and in truth hardly worth reckoning—not worth reckoning at all, so as to jeopardise the credit of the revision for the strictest 'faithfulness.'

Passing on to the next page we come to the rendering of Matt. ii. 1, 'behold wise men from the east came to Jerusalem.' So in ii. 7. In this case the revisers have preferred the alternative expressed by the words 'as few as possible' to that of 'faithfulness' (Rule 1). The original here does not mean 'wise men' at all! It is the word *μάγοι*, *magi* or *magians*, as the margin informs us. But

why not place a word of such distinct historical import and interest in the text? Was it not one of the main objects of the revision to make corrections of this kind? The Magians were a sacred order among the Persians and other ancient oriental peoples. They were priests, soothsayers, and interpreters of dreams, and to have their approval or recognition was important to the character or success of any undertaking. So these great personages come seeking 'the child Jesus,' and desire to 'worship him,' the greatest act of homage that they could offer him. To designate such men as merely 'wise' is to rob them of all their distinctive value. They were 'Magians' whose testimony to the new-born Christ would, in the estimation of all beholders, at once establish his Messianic character. This is no doubt what the evangelist intends us to understand in introducing so particularly and carefully the fact of their visit to Bethlehem. But our revisers have strangely left all this out of sight. For some reason, best known to themselves, they have rubbed out the historic colouring of the passage, by putting the right word in the margin, where it will not be read, and the wrong one in the text, where it will.

Perhaps it will be thought that this may have been done out of consideration for ignorant readers who would only have been puzzled by so strange a word as Magians. But the admission of a new word would have had an obvious advantage. It would have given occasion to such readers to inquire what it meant, and so probably to extend their knowledge. At any rate, it would seem to be as reasonable to substitute the right word for the wrong one here as to have changed the old familiar 'deputy' in several cases into 'proconsul,' Acts xviii. 12, &c. It may be noted, too, that in Acts xiii. 6, 8, the word *μᾶγος* is rendered after the Authorised by 'sorcerer:' so that the harmonising spirit, which has led to important changes in several instances, has here been off its guard, and a word of a comparatively vague and colourless character has been allowed to represent one that is very definite and distinctive, as much so, perhaps, as the words 'publican' or 'pharisee.'

We come next, passing over various minor points, to three instances in which the new rendering 'the evil one' invites our attention. In Matt. v. 37, we read, 'Let your speech be, Yea, yea: Nay, nay: and whatsoever is more than these is of the evil one.' The margin runs, 'Or evil: as in ver. 39; vi. 39.' This tells us that affirmations which are stronger than Yea, yea: Nay, nay, are the suggestion of Satan. Can this really have been the speaker's meaning? Such a saying looks too like the utterance of mere fanaticism, to have come from the lips of that calm and gracious Teacher to whom the words are ascribed. But then consistency of rendering would seem to have required the assimilation of the rendering here to that adopted in Matt. vi. 13, 'Deliver us from the evil one;' for, if this be correct, the same rendering could hardly be

refused to the identical words ⁴ in v. 37, although, strange to say, it *is* refused to them in v. 39, 'Resist not the evil *man*.' Why then is consistency sacrificed here? Something may be reasonably allowed for the context, and this may have determined for '*man*,' rather than for 'the evil *one*.' But if so, why was not the same regard for the context allowed its weight in the Lord's Prayer? For, let it be observed, although the words τοῦ πονηροῦ may be grammatically rendered 'the evil *man*,' 'the evil *one*,' or 'the evil,' i.e. 'evil' in the abstract, yet the expressions immediately associated with the phrase in the Lord's Prayer require the last of these meanings and exclude the two others. There is no question that ὁ πονηρός is used for Satan, as in Matt. xiii. 19, comp. Mark iv. 15: but this meaning of the words is here determined not only by their certainly masculine form, but also and still more by the immediate context. This clearly requires a personal agent to make the sense complete; and so it is in one or two other cases, where the personal meaning appears to be intended—as, perhaps (not certainly), in 1 John v. 19. But in the Lord's Prayer (to which John xvii. 15 is in this point parallel), there is no necessity of this kind to fix the personal meaning. On the contrary the associated words and ideas exclude it. 'Forgive us our debts,' 'lead us not into temptation,' and immediately afterwards, 'if ye forgive not men their trespasses': debts, temptation, trespasses, are all words of a general or quasi abstract meaning, with no personal meaning at all. To these words 'evil' is parallel, but 'evil *one*' is not so. This would appear to be in itself a sufficient reason for leaving the Authorised alone, and putting 'evil *one*' in the margin as no doubt a possible alternative. It was certainly a sufficient reason on the principle of the first rule, to make the changes 'as few as possible.'

But there is other and even stronger ground than this. The words τὸ πονηρόν occur twice in the New Testament with the general or abstract meaning, as similar phrases often do in classical writers. The two places are Luke vi. 45, 'The evil man (ὁ πονηρός) . . . bringeth forth evil' (τὸ πονηρόν); Rom. xii. 9, 'abhorring evil' (τὸ πονηρόν). These cases are beyond question, and they would abundantly have justified the retention of 'evil,' as in the Authorised form of the prayer. But then Satan was a personage of supreme importance with the old Church Fathers, as indeed he still is with no small number of modern theologians. They saw him and his bad influence everywhere, as they are still seen by multitudes. Hence the incredibly superstitious notions which the same Fathers held respecting the actual present exercise of diabolical agency in their own day, and in some cases, as they believed, under their own eyes. Any one may see the evidence of this by referring to an easily accessible book, Conyers Middleton on the Miraculous Powers, in

⁴ The preposition in Matt. v. 37 and John xvii. 15 is ἐκ; in Matt. vi. 13 it is ἀπό.

which it is shown, by the citation of their words, that the Fathers held the belief in Satan in the most gross and superstitious form. They make statements on the subject which are incredible, and could only proceed from ignorant and inconsiderate men. As a matter of course the Greek Fathers read the Lord's Prayer by the lurid light of such ideas.

Naturally, therefore, to such men the words under notice could mean nothing else but 'the evil one;' and accordingly a long series of passages may be drawn from their writings, in which they appear to assent to and accept this interpretation of the words. Of course, as Greek was their native tongue, it must not be said that the words cannot mean what these writers tell us they mean. But they were not infallible. They were very much the contrary; and the probability is, when all the considerations bearing upon the subject are duly weighed, that the Fathers were wrong, and that they were simply misled to interpret the words as they did by the superstition of their times, the bondage of which weighed so heavily upon themselves. At the same time it is not to be questioned that the belief in Satan was held by the 'Teacher' himself; but it is not necessary to hold that He embodied it in this passage of his teachings. It would then have been perfectly reasonable, out of regard to the probabilities of the case, to put 'the evil one' into the margin, in the usual way, for the use of such as prefer it; but it does seem to be unpardonable to lower the character of this otherwise beautiful and comprehensive prayer by introducing into it for modern use so gross and unspiritual an idea—to do this, too, without absolute *certainty* that it is correct. And that such certainty did not exist, even in the minds of the revisers themselves, is shown by the fact of the alternative rendering which they have placed in their margin.

Another passage in the same neighbourhood calls for a few remarks—remarks again not of approval but of disapproval and protest. Matt. v. 22, 'shall be in danger of the hell of fire'—and so in two other instances. In the Authorised Version, 'hell' is the rendering of two different words, *Gehenna* and *Hades*. The latter of these is to be no longer so expressed. Being a proper name, it is left by the revisers untranslated; and so the revised text will be enriched by a new word—new at least to the English Bible—the word *Hades*, which will be found to occur eleven times. This treatment of the word, in as much as it is a proper name, is correct; but then *Gehenna* is a proper name also! Why, therefore, has not this been retained, but rendered by the ugly word 'hell'? And 'hell of fire' seems especially objectionable, for two reasons: first, only one kind of hell is known to the New Testament, while this phrase suggests other hells of a different nature, thus indirectly and quite needlessly importing into the Christian books the conception of certain Pagan mythologies, as to hells of a variety of kinds;—secondly, the added

words 'of fire' (or 'of the fire'), are they more than a simple Hebraism? If not, the meaning of the expression 'Gehenna of fire,' is most probably 'the burning Gehenna,' and no more. The reader may see a similar form in Luke xviii. 6, 'judge of unrighteousness,' properly Englished by 'unrighteous judge.'

The probability of this interpretation arises from the nature of the case. Gehenna was the name of a valley near Jerusalem. The word by its Hebrew etymology means 'valley of Hinnom,' an ancient name found in the Old Testament (2 Kings xxiii. 10, 2 Chron. xxviii. 3). In former times it had been the scene of idolatrous rites and of human sacrifices to the god Moloch. Hence to the later Jews it was a place of abomination, and to mark its character it was defiled by the various refuse of the city there thrown and kept burning that it might be consumed. A veritable place of fire, deserving of its name and reputation! where amidst corrupting matters worms too might live, until the all-consuming element swallowed them up. Thus there was here literally a *πῦρ αἰώνιον*, an age-enduring fire, an 'unquenchable fire'—a place 'where their worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched' (Mark ix. 43, 48).

It is easy to understand that, Gehenna being such a place as this, it would become the representative, in popular speech, of the place of punishment reserved for the wicked and the unbelieving, who were doomed to destruction at the final judgment on the coming of the Messiah. The ungodly should be cast into the burning Gehenna and consumed: it does not appear that they were to be *kept alive*, burning for ever, this being a later addition to the ancient conception. The ideas associated with the mediæval hell—such as may be seen painted on the wall of the Campo Santo at Pisa—are unknown to the Gospels, and have only been added to the original name in its modern form by the lively imaginations of speculative theologians. In other words, the representation of 'Gehenna' by 'hell' is clearly unjustifiable, because this terrible word now suggests ideas of horror and misery which have no foundation in New Testament usage, when due regard is paid to the origin and history of the word Gehenna. It might have been expected that a body of revisers such as the Westminster Company would have been able to raise themselves above the popular conceptions of our day, and would have given us a rendering of the words in question which was fairly based not upon the long-descended notions of the darkest ages of mediæval superstition, but upon the just historical considerations which are applicable to the subject. Those who expected so much as this, it is a pity to think, will be disappointed; and so it is reserved for a future revision, if ever such a thing shall come to pass, to do justice to words and thoughts which, in connection with this subject, have been so long misrepresented—to the sore discredit, with many thoughtful minds, of the Christian Gospel.

But here, leaving many interesting passages, changed or unchanged, without comment, I must bring this paper to a close. Whatever the imperfections of the revised version may be, still, it must be admitted, the revision is a good work accomplished. It will at least awaken thought and stimulate inquiry, in quarters in which these have been too apt to slumber. It breaks the spell which the old Authorised had thrown over the religious world, or at least the English Protestant part of it. People will no longer look upon the English Bible, chapter headings and italics included, as if it had been dropped from heaven just as it is; and perhaps it will be more easy than it was to get a truth of modern science into the heads of ordinary religious people, even in the face of apparent difficulty arising on the side of the Bible. This will be a gain to the cause of Truth and Reason which all truthful and reasonable men will be glad to see.

G. VANCE SMITH.

WHAT IS A POUND?

THIS old question which Sir Robert Peel so much rejoiced in has once more cropped up, and in the remarks I wish to make upon it I desire to say a few words upon what *was* a pound and what *may be* a pound.

In his speech on the Bank Act of 1844 he says of the principle of the metallic standard: 'It must at the same time be admitted that it would be quite consistent with that principle to adopt some other measure of value than that which we have adopted. It would be consistent with that principle to select silver instead of gold as the standard, or to have a mixed standard of gold and silver, *the relative value of the two metals being determined*, or to dispense with gold coin altogether, and regulate the amount and value of the paper currency by making it convertible only, according to the proposal of Mr. Ricardo, into gold bullion of a given minimum amount.'

The authority of this great financier may therefore be cited as showing that bimetallism as now proposed is not otherwise than in accordance with the principle of the metallic standard.

The Earl of Liverpool made his proposal for a gold standard on the ground that Great Britain is 'so distinguished for its affluence and for the extent of its commercial connections, that gold coins are best adapted to be the principal measure of property.'

The monometallists in the present controversy maintain this doctrine, and assert that the superior wealth of England enables her to keep her gold standard, while less wealthy nations, such as Germany, Italy, &c., could not do so. On the other hand, the bimetallists declare that this supremacy would continue and even increase if England submitted herself to a general law agreed on in concert with other nations. The Americans believe that their wealth, intelligence, commercial activity, and undeveloped resources will enable them, if they are forced into a gold standard, to outstrip England in the race for wealth, and to draw from England's store of gold a sufficient amount to place them in the foremost rank.

. The present controversy dates from the first monetary conference in Paris, which sat in June 1867, and which was called for the purpose of 'appreciating more earnestly the advantages which would be derived from the unification of coinages.'

At the very first meeting the question of standards arose, and on its arising the existence of the double standard seemed so little understood that the delegate from Russia, having been placed among those representing the double-standard countries, declared that there was only one standard in Russia, that of silver; but he was corrected by Monsieur de Parieu, the French delegate, who informed him that both metals were legal tender in both countries.

On the 20th of June, at the third sitting, the proposition 'that the desired result, namely, monetary unification, is attainable on the basis and condition of adopting the exclusive gold standard,' was carried with one dissentient voice.

In 1871 the German demonetisation of money commenced, and in 1873 an act of Congress was passed by which silver was legally demonetised in the United States, which act was, however, corrected by what is called the Bland Bill, enforcing the coinage of a certain amount of silver monthly. In 1878 another international monetary conference assembled at Paris, at which the German Empire was not represented, but, notwithstanding the absence of that important element, the European States, through their delegates, agreed 'that it is necessary to maintain in the world the functions of silver as well as those of gold,' thereby coming to a conclusion at variance with that at which the previous conference had arrived.

A third conference is now sitting. Since the demonetisation of silver in Germany, a change which was the legitimate consequence of the verdict of 1868, a continued fall of prices has taken place, and one of the subjects of dispute between those engaged in the battle of the standards is, whether that depreciation of prices and the existing depression of trade are due to the usual ebb and flow of commercial life caused by bad harvests and the cupidity and folly of man, or whether they are due in a great measure to the currency revolution of 1873.

The English system of metallic currency is founded on Lord Liverpool's letter to the King on coins, on the report of the Bullion Committee of 1810, and on the various Acts relating to the resumption of what were called cash payments, or the right to receive standard coin in exchange for banknotes.

Most people are aware that previous to 1819 our circulation was a paper one, but few are aware that, previous to the suspension of cash payments, it was bimetallic, and not measured by a gold standard. Of this fact it must be supposed that Sir Robert Peel was not conscious when he made his famous speech on the resumption of cash payments in 1819, the peroration of which contains the following sentence: 'Every consideration of sound policy and every obligation of strict justice should induce us to restore the ancient and permanent standard of value.'

Now, this is precisely what he did not do, but what the bimetallicists are now advising. What they wish for is a return to the

• ‘ancient standard of the realm’ in common with the rest of the nations of the earth.

The fall of prices which took place after the institution of the modern, not ancient, gold standard of 1816, and that which has taken place since the demonetisation of silver in Germany, have both been the subject of a most voluminous literature.

The evils connected with the fall in prices are disputed by some economists, so in alluding to them I prefer to quote the remarks of those whose orthodoxy is undoubted. Mr. Giffen said in 1879:—

I have come to the conclusion that not only is there a decline of prices at the present time from the high level established a few years ago, but that this decline is more serious than the downward fluctuations of prices usually exhibited in dull times, and that it may be partly of a permanent character, unless some great change should occur in the condition of business at an early date. . . .

The reason is that a sudden pressure on the precious metals at a given period tends to disturb the money markets of the countries using them. . . .

Altogether, during the last six years, Germany has coined 84,000,000, the accumulation of gold in the United States amounts to 30,000,000 sterling.

A falling off in the supply of gold, as well as the increased demand, is then described.

Now, if these things are admitted by the monometallists, the question arises to what extent is the fall in prices an evil? and what is evil, and what is good, to a writer on political economy?

In my humble opinion, violent, sudden, and frequent oscillations in the price of commodities are an evil. A long continuance of the inability to obtain the due return for their labours, be they what they may, is an evil to ordinary men. It is an evil for those who have made fair and honest calculations, founded on a belief in a continuance of steady returns of any kind, to find them permanently falsified to their loss and detriment. It is bootless to tell us that we must consider this as a chronic question, irrespective of the immediate effect of such sudden changes. If an enormous depreciation in prices of all things produced in England be not an evil, then I admit the bimetallist would be very wrong to press his views on the public notice.

The inflation of prices in 1872 was felt to be a most undoubted evil to consumers; to those who produced nothing it was an unmixed evil. To these same persons the state of commercial depression is • rather a good than an evil. They receive as much now as they did before, and they pay less for what they consume. But to those who are neither enthusiasts nor doctrinaires the sudden inflation of prices which went by the name of the coal famine was a great evil, though perhaps not so great as the present depression, which, though less sudden, appears more lasting, and therefore may be more mischievous in its results.

Consumers may be the better for this state of things, but it must

be allowed that if the interests of consumers who have produced nothing are to be weighed against those of consumers who have produced something—that is to say, the drones against the working bees—these working bees always have been, and always must be, the objects of first consideration.

Philosophers tell us to postpone all thoughts of the interests of producers, in the hope that fifty years hence all things may be set straight again and trade go on as before, even though ‘all prices be approximately doubled or halved, the interest of creditors and debtors being affected to that extent while the change was in progress.’ Neither creditors nor debtors would bear the doubling their property with modesty, or the halving it with equanimity, even though the operation might vindicate the perfection of the doctrines of Locke and of Lord Liverpool.

Having stated the extent to which I believe certain evils exist, I proceed to say what bimetallism is and what it is not.

The bimetallism proposed is the free mintage of the two precious metals at a given fixed ratio of $15\frac{1}{2}$ to 1 in all countries agreeing to a convention for the establishment of the principle. It naturally would entail the legal tender of either metal at the option of the debtor for the payment of all debts.

Bimetallism is not an attempt to make silver or gold, or both together, the currency of any country, the probability being that under such an arrangement no alteration would take place as to the coin in which the ordinary transactions of life are carried on. Bankers would, as they do now, hold in their tills just such notes, coin, or change as their customers require, and would not, any more than they do now, force their creditors or depositors to take away sacks of five-franc pieces or crowns when they want cash with which to pay their wages or bills. Legally, of course, this could be done; but as the habit now is to keep precisely that form of currency which depositors require, so would it be under a bimetallic system. The example of this is to be found in England in the last century. The law was bimetallic, but the practice was a gold currency. In India, if a bimetallic law were promulgated to-morrow, in practice silver would continue to be used.

Bimetallism existed in this country from 1717 to 1778, during which period an Englishman could pay his debts either in gold or in silver to the amount of 25*l.* in tale and any amount in weight. Bimetallism existed in France from the beginning of this century to 1873, during which period it is not denied that both gold and silver have been the prevailing currency of that country, though not both at the same time; nor is it denied that during that period the relative prices of gold and silver were kept almost exactly at the legal rate of $15\frac{1}{2}$ to 1, not only in France, the bimetallic country, but in the markets of the world, or that England, having been bimetallic pre-

vously, returned to cash payments in 1819 in gold alone, thereby causing an important loss to debtors and gain to creditors.

The following may be shortly stated as the fundamental propositions of bimetallists, which they assert have not been answered.

1. That the precious metals used for circulation are so large a proportion of the existing mass that the amount in use for any other purpose is too small to have any influence on their value.

2. That the amount used by the larger States so far exceeds that of the rest of the world that any agreement made by them for the regulation of the relative value must of necessity fix it to the world at large.

3. That there is nothing impossible or impracticable in an international agreement for the fixing of the rate.

4. That the ratio of $15\frac{1}{2}$ to 1 having been maintained for nearly the whole of the present century by the French bimetallic arrangement, it would be the best ratio at which to fix it.

At the present moment it is of paramount importance that these propositions should either be answered or proved to be beside the question. Those who are occupied in discussing it are apt to treat it as if it were only a chronic question, and not one requiring immediate attention. If it had not been the subject of attention in 1868, it is quite true that no one would have dreamed of stirring it in 1881. Both parties to the controversy are agreed that it would have been far better if Germany had never followed up the conclusions of 1868.

To those who argue that this is a chronic question and not necessary to be immediately considered, the following facts are not unworthy of attention.

It has been shown that by the admission of the advocates of monometallism the evils of trade depression are to be traced to the diminution of the supplies of gold, and to the increased demand for it, and it is now proposed to show that the latter cause is likely to be increased if Germany throws her silver on the market, if Italy resumes cash payments in gold, and if America completes her gigantic task of resumption and recall of her bonds by resorting, as many of her financiers wish to do, to a monometallic gold currency.

Mr. Jevons admits this when he says:—

It stands to reason, of course, that if several great nations suddenly decide that they will at all cost have gold currencies to be coined in the next few years the annual production cannot meet the demand, which must be mainly supplied, if at all, out of stock. The result would be a tendency to a fall in prices.

The question, then, is not whether a change in currency is a good thing or a bad thing, because we are all agreed that it is a bad thing, but whether the change of England to bimetallism or that of the Latin Union and the United States to a monometallic gold standard would be the greater evil.

Some of the adherents of the single standard assure us that it is

an error to suppose that it is possible to make such a change as this at all, and, granting that possibility, that we insure greater steadiness in prices than at present. Again I prefer to quote Mr. Jevons rather than to express my own opinion.

In his work on *Money and the Mechanism of Exchange* he says:—

I have no doubt whatever that M. Wolowski is theoretically quite correct in what he says about the compensatory action of the double-standard system. English writers seem to have completely misunderstood the question, asserting that the system exposes us to the extreme fluctuations of both metals. . . . Nor is this the whole error of English writers. A little reflection must show that MM. Wolowski and Courcelle Leneuil are quite correct in urging that a compensatory or, as I should prefer to call it, equilibratory action goes on under the French currency law, and tends to maintain gold and silver more steady in value than they would otherwise be.

Imagine two reservoirs of water, each subject to variations of supply and demand. In the absence of any connecting pipe the level of the water in each reservoir will be subject to its own fluctuations merely, but if we open a connection, the water in both will assume a certain mean level, and the effect of any excessive supply or demand will be distributed over the whole area of both reservoirs.'

From this it will be seen that the more serious of the mono-metallists admit the superior steadiness of the bimetallic system.

One of the objections to bimetallism is that it would vitiate contracts and alter prices. I have shown that in these respects we cannot shut ourselves up in our insular security. There is no 'silver streak' in commerce; prices have been disordered by German demonetisation, and the perfection of the English system no longer carries with it the success which was supposed to attend it. Prince Bismarck, who administers the affairs of Germany, and who adopts the traditional policy of Frederick the Great, to attain to glory by following every road which leads to it, desired to confer upon his country something of the commercial supremacy of England. He believed, or rather his economical advisers believed, that the metropolitan position of England in commerce was due to her single gold standard, and not to her vast capital, her ships and colonies, and her industrial resources. He acted on this opinion, and widespread ruin has been the consequence.

Giving full credit to Lord Liverpool for the perfection of his treatise and for the completeness of his system, I am led to examine, as he would have done, under what circumstances his so-called infallible dogma originated. His letter was written when England was struggling for existence with the rest of the civilised world, and in like manner, in the reign of King William the Third, when Locke was writing, England was engaged in a war for the defence of the liberties and independence of mankind, and neither of these writers had any idea of cosmopolitan agreement upon such matters.

What Lord Liverpool said was, that in a given country it was better to have a single metal made into coins, which should be the

standard of value and national legal tender, but he cites as an example of that necessity the practice of the commercial states and countries on the Continent making foreign bills of exchange, and sometimes other bills, exceeding a certain amount, payable in what is usually called bank money.

Now this important example is to me the most telling argument which can be used in favour of bimetallism by agreement. That bank money which is described by Lord Liverpool as being a necessity in Venice, Genoa, Amsterdam, and Hamburg in past days, seems to me to be more required in London than in any place in the civilised globe. London is now to the world what all those places put together were in other days, and if we strip the bimetallic discussion of all extraneous matter, I should be content to see it argued upon the question of whether bank money could not be made of two metals, either of which would pay a bill of exchange.

If silver were money nowhere, either in the Latin Union, India, Russia, China, or America, it would certainly be better that all things should be reckoned by the London gold standard; but as it is a fact that several of these countries are wholly silver, that the United States is trembling in the balance, and that Italy is desirous of resuming cash payments in the best possible metal, we have to face, as usual in this nether world, the facts as they stand, and not as we wish them to be. And this is precisely what Lord Liverpool did. He examined carefully and exhaustively every fact of past history, and surveyed every circumstance which surrounded him, and his decisions are based upon those facts and upon his personal experience. Viewed in this light, his term of bank money as an expression for convention currency is of paramount importance to the discussion. He described this bank money as being used to pay bills of exchange in certain limited places, and the necessity for it arose from the debased state of the coins in those places, as well as from the variety of them current for ordinary transactions in such centres of commerce, where anything but the payment in a perfect currency would produce great embarrassment in all commercial dealings, and would render the exchange very much against such state or country.

If then the bank money, that is, gold or silver or receipts for them at a fixed relative value, is the same in New York, Frankfort, Vienna, Rome, Paris, and London, and is of a greater certainty and more steady in its value as regards the mass of commodities than either gold or silver separately, then such bank money would approach more nearly the ideal standard of Lord Liverpool than gold bank money alone.

But Mr. Jevons himself has demonstrated that although the variations of the two precious metals measured in commodities would be perhaps more frequent, they would be less violent, and seeing that we have the example of France before us, where a single bimetallic

country not only obeyed the above law, but actually kept the relative prices between the precious metals themselves without any important change, how can it be doubted that if the transactions of all Europe, the United States, and India were added to those of France, the functions of bank money could safely be entrusted to both gold and silver?

Measuring the value of Lord Liverpool's doctrine and his matchless treatise, we must not forget who and what Lord Liverpool was. He was an official mainly occupied with the phenomena which he watched from an official standpoint, and, though practically conversant with almost every branch of official life, he had no real knowledge of the cosmopolitan commercial machinery which it is our business now to discuss.

Monometallists seem to think that the subject has received its last touch from Lord Liverpool's mind. Against his authority I cannot help quoting that of Alexander Baring, first Lord Ashburton, who lived a generation later than Lord Liverpool. He had perhaps the largest and most complete experience of affairs of every kind, except military affairs, of any man of his day. Before he was forty he was the confidential intermediary between Napoleon and the English Government, and shortly afterwards he was the rival of the first Rothschild in financial operations. Subsequently he was the Cabinet friend of Peel and Wellington, and he finished his career by a treaty with America which still goes by his name.

I find that he gave evidence in 1828 as to the consequences which had followed a blind adherence to Lord Liverpool's doctrines, in which he said—

he had always thought that it was possible and desirable to maintain in this country a silver currency as a legal tender founded on the proportion of silver to gold established in the currency of France, or something very near it.

And he gives as a reason for that opinion—

that a sudden change from peace to war, a bad harvest, or a panic year arising from over-trading and other causes, imposes upon the Bank of England, which is the heart of all our circulation, the necessity, for the purpose of protecting itself, to stop the egress of specie, sometimes even to bring in large quantities into the country.

Now it is evident that the Bank wishing to reinforce its supply of specie can do so with infinitely increased facility with the power of either drawing in gold or silver than if it were confined to only one of the metals.

These opinions of Lord Ashburton were given without any wish to stir in the matter, but merely as a contribution to the mass of knowledge in the possession of the Government on the subject.

It may now be well to notice some of the objections that have been made by those who have frankly admitted the superior steadiness of the proposed system over that now in existence. I will take those which seem to me to be perhaps the most important.

One is that it is a direct attempt to force the stream backwards.

that the tendency of all the wealthier and more civilised nations of the world is towards a monometallic gold standard, the superiority of which is so clearly established by the commercial supremacy of that country which for a long time was the only one which had succeeded in enforcing it; that it is idle and impossible to attempt any arrangement founded on another system; that as the experiment made to force silver dollars into use in the United States has failed and might fail under a convention, it is possible that payments in gold might be made a point of commercial honour.

A great many things are possible, but as it has never been found that in commerce or in any other profession people pay more as a point of honour than they are bound to do, and as all payments are made, with the exception of unimportant balances, by paper currency, book transfers, or cheques, it must be clear to every one that that metal or those metals which are the legal security for the ultimate payment of paper in various countries would be the foundation of all legal as well as honourable payment.

I confess, then, that I am not alarmed at this objection. It is founded, without doubt, upon a review of what has taken place in the United States in the eagerness which her citizens have displayed to seize the foremost place both as to national and commercial credit.

Another objection made by a very able writer is that, whatever may be the evils connected with the depreciation of prices and the depression of trade in England, the damage done to India by the fall in the exchanges is wholly imaginary. He states that it 'is political economy of the most elementary description, that the low rate of exchange ruling between England and India has the effect of checking exports to India, and of stimulating imports thence, and that this is precisely what is wanted if India is to pay her obligations here in any shape, and that without such fall in the exchange her financial straits would be much worse than they are.'

There is some truth in this assertion, but then it is utterly incompatible with the arguments generally used by the monometallists, that to raise the value of silver and to depreciate that of gold to their old ratio would inflict a loss upon gold-using countries and confer a great benefit upon those using silver.

One writer has estimated the loss of England by such a transaction as 8,000,000*l.* on her stock of gold, and the profit of France on her stock of silver as 16,000,000*l.*

Nothing can show more clearly the divergence of opinions held by monometallists as to the practical effect of the carrying out of their doctrines to their legitimate conclusion than these two surmises, made by equally competent thinkers and writers.

The next objection which I am bound to notice is the fear which exists in the minds of monometallists as to what would happen in time of war. We are told that a war-making nation would necessarily break the convention and refuse free minting: that is to say, that

if Russia or Chili go to war and issue a forced paper currency, this act would be in breach of the bimetallic convention.

Now, what really happens on such an event taking place is that a belligerent nation does not increase the volume of its own currency by using pieces of paper instead of metal, but by exporting its own metal it increases the volume of the currency in the world at large. Its pieces of paper being discredited, it is obliged to use the precious metals for the payment of everything to be bought abroad, and for its belligerent operations, and it can and does enforce upon its subjects the duty of receiving and paying in pieces of paper at home.

The monometallist seems to imagine that at the same moment when a belligerent is by a natural process exporting its precious metals, some other country or body of merchants, either from mere curiosity or from a desire to test the convention, would send precious metals back into that belligerent country and have them minted. This proposition is so absurd that it need only be stated clearly to secure its refutation.

The issue of paper by a belligerent would have, under a bimetallic convention, precisely the same effect which it has now. The explanation of the operation would, however, lead me into a too lengthy paper. I content myself, then, with stating my belief that the temporary effect of war and of forced paper currencies would be somewhat the same as a large discovery of the precious metals, and would be spread over a larger surface and more evenly under an international bimetallic convention than with the present separate national standards.

Having answered some of the most recent objections started to bimetallicism, I approach the consideration of certain remedies which have been suggested in substitution of it. One proposal is to permit the raising of the limit of legal currency of silver coin to five pounds, instead of two pounds as at present. Considering that any one may, if he like it, pay forty shillings in discharge of a debt, and that, as far as my experience goes, it is never done, it is highly improbable that any one would dream of carrying about sums of two, three, or four pounds in his pocket in silver for the purpose of vindicating the rights of that beautiful metal.

Another plan is to issue twenty or thirty millions of one-pound notes, of which twenty might be on securities. Thus we find men who are aghast at the notion of a currency which, though it does not rest upon gold alone, is yet founded upon a metallic basis quite ready to increase the circulation by emitting a large amount of paper, having no tangible metallic basis at all. If this proposition means anything, it means that in England, as is now the case in Ireland and Scotland, every one would use one-pound notes instead of sovereigns. Those who are in favour of this proposition would do well to read the chapter in Lord Liverpool on paper currency, in which he says :—

It is certain that the smaller notes of the Bank of England, and those issued by country bankers, have supplanted the gold coins, usurped their functions, and driven a great part of them out of circulation: in some parts of Great Britain, and especially in the southern parts of Ireland, small notes have been issued to supply the place of silver coins, of which there is certainly a great deficiency.

I will first observe, that if this practice is suffered to continue, as at present, without any limitation, there can be neither use nor advantage in converting bullion of either of the precious metals into coins, except so far as it may serve for the convenience of your Majesty's subjects in their most private concerns; that is, no greater quantity than many of the writers who have of late speculated on this subject will allow to continue in currency: the bullion of which these coins are made had better be exported in its natural state, like any other unmanufactured commodity for the use of which the trade of the country has no occasion. The coins of your Majesty, when carried into foreign countries, will only be valued as bullion; and the precious metals, whether exported in coins or in bullion, will equally serve the purpose of a commercial capital; and it is useless and absurd to impose upon the public the expense of making coins, merely for the purpose of sending them out of the kingdom.

I have now endeavoured to show that international bimetallism would be in accordance with the opinions and principles of some of those who are looked up to by economical writers with profound and deserved veneration; that Sir Robert Peel admitted bimetallism to be in accordance with the principle of the metallic standard; that Lord Ashburton had good reason for thinking that it would have the effect of facilitating the return to commercial calm after ordinary stormy weather; and that the views of Lord Liverpool as to the value of bank money would be more nearly acted upon by creating an international measure of value than by adhering to a separate national standard.

The most singular part of the whole controversy is that both this country and the United States seem to have abolished the silver element in their standard accidentally.

It has already been shown that in 1819 the question of silver hardly found a place in the resumption discussion in England, and with regard to the United States Mr. Groesbeck, the delegate of that country at the conference of 1878, stated that the demonetisation of silver in 1873 was passed 'through inadvertence,' and on being asked what he meant by it he said that it had occurred when the Government was in a state of suspension, and when public attention was not sufficiently directed to the subject, and further that a number of members of Congress had confessed to him that they had not known what they were doing.

The Conference at Paris has now been adjourned till the 30th of June, in order that the delegates may receive fresh instructions. The opinions of most of the governments were already so well known that, beyond bringing the questions at issue into a still more definite and condensed shape than they were before, there is little fresh to remark upon except the important propositions made on behalf of

the Indian Government by Sir Louis Mallet, and by Baron de Thielmann on behalf of Germany.

The former is simply a promise not to demonetise silver. The German proposition is founded on the admission that 87,000,000*l.* of gold had been coined, that 54,000,000*l.* of silver had been demonetised, and that the expenses of this operation had amounted to 2,200,000*l.*, while 25,000,000*l.* of silver still remains in Germany.

To enable those countries where silver had not been demonetised to carry out the reforms which the Conference had met to consider, the German Empire is willing to abstain from all sales of silver for a fixed period, and to confine itself afterwards to such a limited amount as would not encumber the general market.

Thalers might be forbidden to be sent to the mints of the bi-metallic union, or those mints might refuse to take them, so as to make the operation of selling them too costly.

Germany would also be willing to recall the gold pieces of five marks and the treasury notes of the same value and to re-issue five and two mark pieces to the amount of about 8,000,000*l.*, taking as a base a ratio between the two metals as near as possible to $15\frac{1}{2}$ instead of that which, according to the present law, equals a ratio of about 1 to 14.

Having heard the above propositions from Germany, the energies of the Conference were devoted on the one hand to the persuasion of the English delegates to make some concessions, and on the other to induce France and the United States to proceed to a practical solution in case England should be unwilling to accede to their wishes.

It would be obviously improper for me to offer any opinions on the projects submitted or to be submitted to our Government in furtherance of the common object which all parties have in view—namely, the steadying of the prices of the precious metals in relation to commodities.

In this discussion my wish has been to keep clear from anything like zeal and enthusiasm. I am absolutely without any prejudice in the matter, and I have confined myself, in the evidence I have quoted, with the exception of that of Lord Ashburton, to the facts honestly brought out by those from whom I differ, so that I may say that the small bias which exists in my mind upon the subject is almost entirely due to the study of my opponents' opinions.

If, then, I am forced to answer the question 'What is a pound?' I incline to answer it in the words of Sir Robert Peel—namely, that we ought to return to 'the ancient standard of the realm,' or, as the Americans call it, 'the dollar of our fathers,' rather than to adhere to the measure carried by that statesman, and founded upon Lord Liverpool's letter.

H. R. GRENFELL.

ERNEST RENAN.

THE little town of St. Renan in Cornwall, and various springs and waters in other Celtic regions, preserve for us the memory of an anomalous and a formidable saint. Ronan or Renan, indeed, seems properly to have been one of those autochthonous divinities, connected with earth and the elements, who preceded almost everywhere the advent of more exalted gods. He was received, however, after some hesitation, into the Christian Pantheon, and became the eponymous saint of a Celtic clan. This clan of Renan migrated from Cardigan-shire to Iedano on the Trieux in Brittany, about the year 480, and have ever since lived in honourable poverty, engaged in tilling the ground and fishing on the Breton coast; one of the families who there form an unexhausted repository of the pieties and loyalties of the past.

From this simple and virtuous stock, in this atmosphere of old-world calm, Ernest Renan was born sixty years ago. In a charming series of autobiographical papers¹ he has sketched his own early years; his childhood surrounded by legends of the saints and of the sea; his schooling received from the pious priests of Tréguier; and then his sudden transference, in 1836, as the most promising boy of his district, to the Petit Séminaire Saint Nicolas du Chardonnet at Paris, where for three years he was one of M. Dupanloup's most eager pupils. Thence he was sent for four years to Issy, the country establishment of the Séminaire Saint-Sulpice, to receive his final preparation for the priesthood. For to that life he had always aspired, and had he been left beneath the shadow of his Breton cathedral, he might have become a learned and not an unorthodox priest. But now his education had gone too far; sojourn in Paris, even in a seminary, had awakened his critical and scientific interests, and he began to feel that such a career was impossible to him. He left it with hesitation and much self-questioning, but without bitterness and without subsequent regrets. Much pain naturally followed on this disruption of life-long affections and ties. There were material hardships too, but his sister's devoted care solaced and supported him till he had made friends of his own, and reached an independent position. His attain-

¹ *Revue des Deux Mondes*, September, October, 1876; November, 1880.

ment, in 1847, of the Volney Prize for a treatise on the Semitic languages, afterwards developed into a general history, may be taken as the first step in a long career of successful literary and scientific labour. To one episode in that career—his professorship of Hebrew at the Collège de France—we shall have to recur again; but with this exception we may confine our attention to his published works alone; always the most satisfactory course in the case of a yet living man whose writings, and not his actions, have made him a public character.

The subjects of these works are so various, and they indicate so far-reaching a study of the development of the human mind, that some brief sketch of their scope is essential if we would understand on how wide an induction the views of this great historical critic are based. It is in the garden of Eden that M. Renan makes his first appearance on the field of history, and his localisation of that cradle of the Semitic,—perhaps also of the Aryan race,—in the Beloortag, near the plateau of Pamir, at the junction of the Beloortag with the Himalayas, forms one of the most interesting discussions in his history of the Semitic languages.² It is at this point in the world's career that he is inclined to place the beginning of articulate speech; and his treatise on the origin of language³ embodies a theory of great ingenuity, but which, however, our increasing knowledge of primitive man is daily rendering less plausible. From the great delicacy and complexity of some of the oldest idioms which have reached us, and from the fact that the history of language, almost everywhere that we can trace it, is a history of simplification and dissolution, M. Renan argues that language appeared at once in a highly-organised state, as the suddenly projected image of the mental operations of families of mankind far removed from barbarism. Comparative philology has entered on a different phase since this treatise appeared, and should it ever be re-written its author will have to take into account many further observations on the phenomena of savage speech, many new conceptions as to the development of the mind of primitive man. From these prehistoric questions we pass on to the great settled civilisations, Cushite, Chamite or Turanian, of the early world. On China,⁴ Nineveh,⁵ Egypt,⁶ M. Renan has published admirable essays, but essays which show power of generalisation rather than any specialised acquirement. A brilliant paper on Berber Society,⁷ and some pages on the Soudan,⁸ come under the same category. At Babylon he enters the field as an independent investigator. His tractate 'On the Book of Nabathæan Agriculture' (which survives for us in an Arabic form) is held to have disposed of Professor Chwolson's theory

² *Histoire Générale des Langues Sémitiques.*

⁴ *L'Instruction Publique en Chine.*

⁶ *L'Ancienne Égypte.*

³ *De l'Origine du Langage.*

⁵ *La Découverte de Ninive.*

⁸ *Le Désert et le Soudan.*

⁷ *La Société Berbère.*

that a literary civilisation existed at Babylon 3,000 years before our era.

Coming now to the Semitic stem we find the traces of M. Renan's labours on every member of this group of languages. His *Comparative History*,—a standard work,—has been already referred to. The Phœnicians are his especial province. His work on the mission to Phœnicia,⁹ a Government expedition of archæological survey in which he took part in 1860, is recognised as the highest authority on that ancient people; and the Phœnician department of the great collection of Semitic inscriptions¹⁰ has been entrusted to M. Renan, and is at present the object of his labours. On the Arabs he has written much which carries great weight. His exhaustive monograph on Averroes¹¹ is a complete guide to one of the most complex byways of philosophical history. His essay on Mahomet,¹² and his articles on Hariri, Maçoudi, Ibn-Batoutah,¹³ compress into a short compass the very spirit of Arab literature and life. It is, however, on the history and literature of the Jews that he has expended most time and thought. Without dwelling on minor performances, in the *Journal de la Société Asiatique* and elsewhere, we may notice first his translations of Job¹⁴ and of Solomon's Song,¹⁵ as admittedly equal to any German work for thoroughness and accuracy, while showing in their style and in the introductions prefixed to them a literary grace and insight which are M. Renan's own. The preface to the Book of Job, in particular, may well lead us to look forward with a peculiar interest to that *History of the Jewish People* by which it is understood that M. Renan purposes to complete his account of the origins from which Christianity sprang. In the meantime it is with the birth of Christ that his systematic treatment of Jewish history and literature begins. The *Vie de Jésus*, which forms the first volume of the *Origines du Christianisme*, owes both to its merits and its defects a celebrity which has tended to cast into the background other works of its author, which possess at least equal value. The *Vie de Jésus* has been followed by *Les Apôtres*, *Saint Paul*, *L'Ante-christ*, *les Évangiles*, *L'Église Chrétienne*, and the series is even now being concluded by *Marc-Aurèle*, which last volume leaves the Christian Church an established power in the full light of day. The completion of this long series—the *magnum opus* of M. Renan's career—renders some general review of his labours especially appropriate at the present time.

These labours, however, have not been confined to the Semitic race. Turning to the Aryan stock, we find, to begin with, an essay on

⁹ *Mission de Phénicie.*

¹⁰ *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum.*

¹¹ *Averroès et l'Averroïsme.*

¹² In the *Études d'Histoire Religieuse.*

¹³ In the *Mélanges d'Histoire et de Voyages.*

¹⁴ *Le Livre de Job, &c.*

¹⁵ *Le Cantique des Cantiques, &c.*

the Primitive Grammar of India, and, for the Persian branch, an article on the Schahnameh.¹⁶ On the Greco-Roman branch of the family he has written much of interest, though not often in a separate form. Essays on the Greek grammarians, on the philology of the ancients, on the Secret History of Procopius, indicate unlooked-for stores of learning held in reserve. The volumes on the Origin of Christianity deal with the history of the earlier Empire with a vividness and mastery unequalled by any other historian of that age. In Marcus Aurelius, especially, he has found a hero on whom he can dwell with all the eloquence of complete sympathy. Descending now to the Latin nations of modern times, we find an interesting essay on Mussulman Spain, and two on the revolutions of Italy, and Dom Luigi Tosti,¹⁷ the second of which will be recognised as a masterpiece by all who are familiar with the great story of Italy's resurrection. French history may conduct us from the Latin to the Celtic branch of the Aryan stock. And here too M. Renan fills a leading place. He has been an important collaborator in the great Benedictine history of French Literature, which, begun a century and a half ago, is still far from completion. In conjunction with M. Victor le Clerc he supplied the history of the fourteenth century, taking the progress of the fine arts as his especial department. His history of Gothic architecture is full of learning and originality, though suggesting (were this a fitting occasion) many topics of æsthetic controversy. Minor essays on the cause of the decline of mediæval art, on the sources of the French tongue, on the farce of Patelin, &c., indicate how completely he has made this period his own. The numerous essays on Frenchmen of more modern date, Thierry, de Sacy, Cousin, Lamennais, Béranger, Villemain, belong rather to literature or to philosophy than to history proper. To conclude, then, with the Celtic stock, to which M. Renan himself belongs. Nothing that he has written is better than his essay on the poetry of the Celtic races,¹⁸ a model of that kind of composition, erudite without ostentation and attractive in the highest degree without loss of dignity or of precision.

I will not extend the list further. It will be obvious that M. Renan has not spared his pains; that his opinions are not founded on a narrow historical induction, on a one-sided acquaintance with the development of the mind of man.

We must now inquire what are the main lines of the teaching which he can support, if necessary, by so varied an appeal to the lessons of the past. This teaching resolves itself into three main branches, educational, political, and religious. I might add the heading of philosophy, under which one at least of his most attractive works would seem naturally to fall.¹⁹ But his own view, as indicated in his essay

¹⁶ In the *Mélanges d'Histoire et de Voyages*. ¹⁷ In *Essais de Morale et de Critique*.

¹⁸ In the same volume.

¹⁹ *Dialogues et Fragments Philosophiques*.

on the Future of Metaphysics, is less ambitious, and prefers to regard philosophy rather as a comprehensive term for the mere aggregate of the highest generalisations than as forming a distinct and coherent department of human study.

M. Renan's educational convictions do not need any elaborate historical support; nor will they be openly disputed in this country. They are, briefly, that the higher instruction should be untrammelled, and that it should be thorough. That the most competent teachers should be appointed, irrespective of any considerations of sect or party; that they should then be allowed to exercise their functions without interference from Church or State; and, on the other hand, that it is their imperative duty to follow truth with their best efforts whithersoever she may lead; these are the substantive themes of many essays of M. Renan's, whether he is praising the *Institut* for its catholicity, or the *Collège de France* for its independence, or the Academy for its permanent and stable power. These topics, indeed, may seem little more than truisms, but truisms may acquire a certain dignity when a man is called upon to suffer for their truth; and it so happens that M. Renan's own career contains an episode which well illustrates the dangers to which honest and candid teaching may still sometimes be exposed, and the spirit in which such dangers should be met.

In the year 1857 the death of M. Quatremère left vacant the chair of 'the Hebrew, Chaldaic, and Syriac languages' at the *Collège de France*. The *Collège de France* was founded by Francis I. expressly for the purpose of providing a lay and independent arena for the exposition of studies which were treated by the Sorbonne under closer restrictions, and in accordance with traditional rules. There is at the *Collège de France* no theological chair, nor has the institution ever been connected with any Church. The functions of its Hebrew professor are in no way hortatory or polemical; on the contrary, it is the place above all others in France where real philological teaching, unbiassed by considerations external to philology, may fairly be looked for. The appointment virtually rests with the other professors and with the members of the Academy of Inscriptions, whose recommendation, addressed to the Minister of Public Instruction, is ratified as a matter of course.

Perhaps through some timidity as to the result* of either the appointment or the non-appointment of M. Renan to the vacant chair, the Emperor did not fill it up till 1861. In that year the Minister of Instruction inquired, according to custom, what candidate the existing professors proposed to nominate. These professors and the Academy of Inscriptions nominated M. Renan, and his appointment was confirmed in January, 1862.

It is customary at the *Collège de France*, as in most other academical lecture-rooms, that a newly-elected professor, of however special and minute a character his subsequent teaching is to be, should

take in his inaugural discourse a wider scope, and give some general sketch of the manner in which he conceives his subject. To have evaded this custom in this special instance would have been to abandon, on the threat of personal inconveniences to follow, the right and duty of those to whom the higher education of their country is entrusted to speak with frankness, though of course with moderation, on all such topics as fall within the competence of their chair. M. Renan did not thus shrink. He gave a masterly sketch of the function of the Semitic peoples in the history of civilisation, and needing to touch on the greatest Figure whom those races have produced, he described him as 'un homme incomparable—si grand que, bien qu'ici tout doive être jugé au point de vue de la science positive, je ne voudrais pas contredire ceux qui, frappés du caractère exceptionnel de son œuvre, l'appellent Dieu.' 'Jesus of Nazareth,' said St. Peter, 'a man approved of God among you;' and if M. Renan had been willing by a turn of phrase to use the Apostle's words for his own, it would have been hard for the orthodox to find an occasion of censure. As it was, the demonstration which had been prepared against him was held in check by a large body of students who maintained order during his lecture and accompanied him home. He had announced that his future lectures were to be purely grammatical; but the imperial government, which was at that time much under the influence of the clerical party, pronounced that a continuance of the course would be dangerous, and closed his lecture-room. M. Renan lectured for two years in his own apartments. The government then announced to him his appointment to a post in the Imperial Library, a post which he could not fill so long as he held the professorship, at the same time abolishing the emolument of his professorship by an ingenious meanness of administrative detail. M. Renan refused to accept the post in the Library, or to resign the professorship. Another professor was appointed, held the post for a few years, and died. On his death in 1870, M. Renan was again selected by the Collège de France and the Institut as the fitting candidate. And now the Emperor consented, but M. Ollivier shuffled, and the war came. It was the Government of National Defence which in November, 1870, signed the decree which re-established the dispossessed professor in the chair which he now fills.

The Grand Inquisitor, like Pope and Pagan, has in our age lost most of his teeth. There can hardly be a surer way, and this episode shows it, of conferring a benefit on a man of learning and virtue than by persecuting him for his opinions' sake. He gets all the advantage of adversity without disablement, and obloquy without disgrace. He has the opportunity (too rarely occurring in the *savant's* quiet career) of showing courage, sincerity, and dignity of character. And meantime his influence is not impaired but increased; his books become more widely known, his personality is invested with greater in-

terest. The time, moreover, is past when anything can be done for opinions accounted orthodox by raising those who hold them to posts for which they are otherwise unfit. These are not days when income can give influence, or official precedence make proselytes.

Attempts of this kind to make conformity with received opinions rather than intellectual competence the first requisite in a teacher have, in fact, their origin in a mood of mind of which religious intolerance is only one manifestation. They spring from a deep-rooted infidelity as to the principles themselves on which all higher education rests. Those principles are, that it is good to have a mind as active and open as possible, and to know all the truth about the universe which can be known. But though these principles are seldom openly contested, many men,—most even of those whose business in life it is to apply them,—hold them in reality in a quite different form. They hold that it is good to have a mind well-trained for purposes of work or enjoyment, and to know enough about the universe to enable us to live well and happily. Now this second view, though it may in some minds be almost identical with the first, may also drop in other minds to a level at which mental training becomes little more than a repertory of artifices, and knowledge than an accomplishment. The tendency to keep the mind shut and to be contented without knowledge is so strong that it is only by steadfastly regarding knowledge as an end in itself that we can be safe against its gradual limitation, till even the arts which affect our material well-being are starved by its decay.

The force with which Germany has grasped this principle has been, it need hardly be said, one of the main elements in all her successes. She has had more scientific curiosity, more interest in truth for truth's own sake, than any other nation, and she has reaped her reward in the serious and painstaking habit of mind, open to new information, and resolved to see things as they are, which has in its turn led her to military and political greatness. It has been one of M. Renan's life-long tasks to hold up to his countrymen the example of Germany, to insist on the need of laborious thoroughness in study, on the nobility of the self-forgetfulness which makes a man neglect his own fame in the interest of his subject. Some of his most striking essays,—those, for instance, on Creuzer, Eugène Burnouf, J. V. le Clerc,—are devoted to the setting forth of such a life with a kindred enthusiasm. And both in France and England such exhortations are greatly needed. Physical science, indeed, is in both countries ardently pursued. But the philological and historical sciences are apt in France to form the mere material for rhetoric, in England the mere machinery of education.

One of the main directions in which the influence of M. Renan's historical-mindedness is felt is in his utterances on politics. There, at any rate, the study of history has saved him from any tendency to rashness or idealism. It has taught him, above all, the doctrine of

compensations,—the application, as one may say, of the law of the conservation of energy to states and nations, which assures us that more than a certain sum of efficiency cannot be extracted from any one race, and that, after gross errors have been avoided, what is gained in force by the body politic in one direction is likely to be lost in another. On the examples of this thesis M. Renan delights to dwell, from the Berbers, enjoying absolute social equality and government by commune at the cost of all national or even tribal coherence, to the German Empire, its collective strength based on a fusion of bureaucracy and feudalism which, in M. Renan's view, must necessarily involve the painful self-abnegation of the mass of men.

One may say, indeed, that the greatness of a nation depends on her containing a certain amount, but only a certain amount, of unselfishness; on her keeping her spiritual life neither above nor below a certain temperature. She can achieve no powerful collective existence if public virtue in her have grown so cold that she contains no class ready to make serious sacrifices for the general good. And on the other hand, if the popular devotion to some impersonal idea be raised to too glowing a pitch, the nation loses in concentration what she gains in diffusion; her idea takes possession of the world, but she herself is spent in the effort which gave it birth. Greece perishing exhausted with her creation of art and science; Rome disappearing, like leaven in the mass, in her own universal empire; Judæa expiating by political nullity and dispersion the spiritual intensity which imposed her faiths, in one form or another, upon civilised man; such are some of the examples with which M. Renan illustrates this general view. And such, to some extent, is his conception of the French Revolution. In the spiritual exhaustion and unsettlement which have followed on that crisis, France has felt the reaction from that fervour of conviction and proselytism with which she sent forth her 'principles of '89' to make the circuit of the world. But those principles were not wholly salutary nor wholly true; they were the insistence—exaggerated by the necessary recoil from privilege and inequality—on one side only of the political problem, on the individual right to enjoyment without regard to those ties and subordinations which make the permanence and the unity of states.

The French Revolution, indeed, was but the manifestation, in a specially concentrated form, of a phase through which the awakening consciousness of the masses must needs conduct every civilised nation in turn. Its characteristic assertions of the independence, the essential equality of men, are apt to lead, if rashly applied, not to any improved social structure, but to sheer individualism, to the jealous spirit of democracy, which resents the existence of lives fuller and richer than its own. This spread of an enlightened selfishness is in the moral world, as M. Renan has remarked, a fact of the same nature as the exhaustion of coal-fields in

the physical world. In each case the existing generation is living upon, and not replacing, the economies of the past. A few words of explanation will make this view clearer. As a general rule, we may roughly say that the self-regarding impulses of brutes and men are limited in the last resort by the need of a certain amount of social instinct, if their family or their species is to be preserved at all. And this instinct, if it may be said without paradox, is often more moral than choice. For reasoning powers, though probably acquired as the result of highly social habits, sometimes partially destroy the very habits out of which they arose by suggesting that more immediate pleasure can be obtained by reversing them. For instance, male monkeys are not systematically cruel to female monkeys. Instinct teaches them to divide the work of the family in the way best suited to the attainment of healthy offspring. But in Australian savages the family instinct is interfered with by a reasoning process which shows them that men are stronger than women, and can unite to make them their slaves. They enslave and maltreat their women with the result that they injure their progeny, and maintain so low a level of vigour that a slight change in their surroundings puts an end to the race. Something of the same kind is the contrast between the feudal peasant of the middle ages and the self-seeking artisan of the present day. The mediæval peasant owed his very existence to the high development of certain social instincts,—fidelity, self-abnegation, courage in defence of the common weal. And thus in a Highland clan, for instance, the qualities which enable a society to hold together existed almost in perfection. The sum of social instincts with which each of its members was born far exceeded any such self-seeking impulses as might (for instance) have led him in time of war to enrich himself by betraying his chief.

Instinctive virtue of this kind, however, can hardly be maintained except by pressure from without. As civilisation develops, the need for it becomes less apparent. The self-abnegation which in a rude society was plainly needed to prevent the tribe's extinction now seems to serve only to maintain a pampered and useless court or aristocracy. The proletariat gradually discover that they are the stronger party, and their instinctive reverence for their hereditary leaders dies away. If circumstances are favourable, they devote themselves to pleasure and money-making; if not, they rise, perhaps, as in 1789, and 'decapitate the nation,' leaving themselves incapable of self-government, and certain to be made the prey of military force, the only power left standing among them.

Meantime it is not only the proletariat whose coherence in the body politic is loosened by the dictates of an enlightened selfishness. The feudal leader, quite as much as his retainer, subsisted by virtue of his possession of certain social instincts,—courage in defending his clan, and a rude identification of his interests and pleasures with

theirs. Even amid the more refined scenes of the Renaissance, the noble had still much in common with the peasant. The young aristocrat (to take M. Renan's illustration), whose marriage procession defiled through the streets of Gubbio or Assisi was delighting the populace and himself by the same action. His instinct was to share his pleasures thus with the commonalty, and he enjoyed them the more for so doing.

But as civilisation becomes more assured, there is no longer anything which the nobleman feels plainly called on to do for the common people, who are protected by law without his aid. And moreover, as numbers get vaster, and differences of wealth more extreme, the rich man finds his pleasure more and more aloof from the poor. His instincts, both of leadership and of companionship, tend to decay; he lives in some luxurious city, and converts his territorial primacy into a matter of rents.

Individualism, in short, as opposed to active patriotism, becomes increasingly the temptation of rich and poor alike. Questions as to forms of government, rivalries of dynasties, are of small importance as compared with the progress of this disintegrating tendency, which forms a kind of dry-rot in all civilised states. The reserve forces of inherited and instinctive virtue (to return to the simile of the coal-fields) are becoming exhausted, and while we live in a society which has been rendered possible by the half-conscious self-devotions of the past, we have not as yet discovered a source of energy which shall maintain our modern states at the moral temperature requisite for organic life.

Reflections of this nature, long familiar to M. Renan, were forced upon all Frenchmen by the Franco-German war. That contest, as has been often observed, repeated the old histories of the incursions of the barbarians into the declining Roman Empire in its contrast between the naïve and self-devoted unity of the one force, and the self-seeking apathy which ruined the other. The main difference was that the Germans, having applied their patient efforts to self-education as well as to warfare, united in a certain sense the advantages of a civilised with the advantages of a barbarous people.

The war passed by, and M. Renan's was perhaps the wisest voice which discussed the maladies of France. France seemed to have before her then the choice of two paths; the one leading through national self-denial to national strength, the other through democratic laxity to a mass of private well-being, likely to place its own continuance above all other aims. In a collection of political essays²⁰ published in 1871, M. Renan advocates the sterner policy in a series of weighty suggestions too detailed for insertion here. Yet he feels the difficulty of carrying out this *régime* of penitence and effort without the help of a commanding central power. He regrets (for he had already foreseen) the impossibility of placing at the head of

²⁰ *La Réforme Intellectuelle et Morale de la France.*

France a strong dynasty, capable of direction to serious ends. All her dynasties have fallen; the experience of 1830, 1848, 1870, has shown that not one of them can survive a single blow; nor can the departed instinct of loyalty be revived by partisans wielding the weapons of superstition, corruption, insolent bravado. Already when M. Renan wrote there seemed no choice but a Republic; and a striking passage (put, it is fair to say, into the mouth of an imaginary speaker) will indicate with how mixed a hope he regarded that prospect:—

Des réformes, supposant que la France abjure ses préjugés démocratiques, sont des réformes chimériques. La France, croyez-le, restera un pays de gens aimables, doux, honnêtes, droits, gais, superficiels, pleins de bon cœur, de faible intelligence politique; elle conservera son administration médiocre, ses comités entêtés, ses corps routiniers, persuadée qu'ils sont les premiers du monde; elle s'enfoncera de plus en plus dans cette voie de matérialisme, de républicanisme vulgaire vers laquelle tout le monde moderne, excepté la Prusse et la Russie, paraît se tourner.

Such a state, in M. Renan's view, can never hope to rival Prussia's strength in the field,—a strength founded on a social organisation which can transform itself into a military organisation when need is, without shock, unwillingness, or delay. The revenge of France, he thinks, is likely to be rather of that insidious kind which saps the enemy's robust self-denial by the spectacle of ease and luxury, and gradually draws down its neighbours to a self-indulgent impotence like its own.

The events of the ten years which have elapsed since this prophecy was uttered may seem to have tended towards its fulfilment. On the one hand, there is visible in Germany an increased impatience of the hardships of the Prussian *régime*, a growing exodus of the lower class to states which demand less of risk and self-sacrifice from their constituent members. And on the other hand, the prestige of Paris as the city of pleasure has revived; the wealth of France, and her eagerness in the pursuit of wealth, are greater than ever before. Her habits and institutions (as M. Renan predicted) are undoubtedly assimilating her not to Germany, but to the United States. The example of the United States,—capable, under strong excitement, of putting forth such military energy from the midst of a society apparently so self-seeking and incoherent,—may well prevent us from asserting that democratic France can never wage a successful war with Germany. But such strong impulses will be rare, and for the most part it would seem that we must look on France as swelling that dominant current of the modern world which sets in the direction of mere wealth and luxury, and threatens to dissolve the higher aims and unity of nations in its enervating flow.

'Without war,' says Von Moltke, 'the world would stagnate, and lose itself in materialism.' The problem is to prevent this; to secure that as the world gradually changes from a place of struggle into a

place of enjoyment, the change shall not sap the roots of virtue or the structure of society. As the old social superiorities, defined by birth, and resting ultimately on force and conquest, tend to disappear, we must create new social superiorities, marked enough to compel the respect of the multitude to their fitting leaders, and attained by enough of effort to give to the character of those leaders the same force and self-confidence which were previously won in war.

In pursuing this train of thought M. Renan surprises the English reader by his apparent want of acquaintance with the similar speculations of Comte. Yet these two greatest thinkers of modern France traverse to a considerable extent the same ground. Fully to note their points of agreement and of difference would demand a separate essay. They agree in the spirit,—historical, scientific, *positive* in the best sense of the term,—in which they approach these social problems, and which guarantees them alike against revolutionary vehemence and against the mere sentimentality of reaction. On the other hand, Comte's confident dogmatism, and the prophetic and hieratic pretensions of his later years, are little in accord with M. Renan's gentle and sceptical irony, his strain of aristocratic nonchalance. In their respective views as to the nature of the government of the future, these divergences are plainly marked. Comte's senate of bankers is the conception of a complacently industrial, a frankly optimistic age; while in M. Renan's fastidious attitude towards material prosperity we discern a certain loss of moral prestige which wealth has tended to undergo even while its practical predominance in the world has increased. Wealth is, of course, the form of superiority which the multitude tend more and more exclusively to respect as the traditional reverence for birth declines. And, in some cases, wealth is a tolerable criterion of merit, as indicating diligence and ability in those by whom it is made, habits of refinement in those by whom it is inherited. But, unfortunately, it becomes increasingly evident that the criterion is too rough; there is too much ill-gotten wealth in the world to allow us to respect it without inquiry; and the dishonest rich man is not merely not better, but is more actively mischievous than his neighbours. America, in short, has become our type of a country which has sought wealth with success; and America is not a country where 'kings are philosophers and philosophers are kings.' Virtue, again, is not easy to recognise on a public arena, and its genuineness is not recommended to us when it loudly claims recognition. We are driven back upon intellectual superiority; and here the problem is to find that disinterested wisdom which is, in fact, a part of virtue, and not the mere plausibility of skilful egoism. There is no certain method of attaining this, but the method which looks most promising is to raise a considerable number of the citizens to a pitch of knowledge and culture, which *ought*, at least, to teach them to look on human affairs as philosophers, and not as adventurers

or as partisans. And this, at least, we can do ; by the thoroughness of our higher education we can create a new aristocracy, an aristocracy which will not press its services on the multitude, but will constitute a weighty court of appeal from popular passion and prejudice. Some such position, indeed, has long been held by men of talent in France, owing to the inadequacy of the French *noblesse*, which never performed important political functions, and has now practically disappeared. And in other countries, too, the public is learning to recognise a sort of senate in one group of learned men,—in the professors, namely, of the physical sciences. Their superior knowledge can be palpably proved and is readily believed in ; their advice is urgently needed about many matters, and the decisiveness of utterance natural to men much occupied with definite and soluble problems is in itself convincing to those who wish for guidance. But to the devotees of the *historical* sciences the world has hitherto paid less attention. Philologists cannot hit upon lucrative inventions ; rival critics cannot demonstrate their historical insight by a crucial experiment. The historian is not so convincing as the physicist, nor does he labour so manifestly for the practical good of mankind. Comte, indeed, claimed to have done away with both these distinctions. He claimed to have given to the science of society a precision which enabled it to be at once applied as an art, and he was eager to subordinate even the highest speculations to the actual needs of men. M. Renan, on the other hand, while desiring no such direct dogmatic influence, is not disposed to shape the course of his researches according to their immediate bearing on the common weal. That ‘passion for truth in itself, without any mixture of pride or vanity,’ which Comte condemns as ‘intense egoism,’ is the very breath of M. Renan’s being ; and, as is wont to be the case when truth rather than utility is aimed at, there are many matters on which he is unwilling to preach any very definite doctrine. ‘*La vérité est dans une nuance*,’ he says ; and again, ‘*Qui sait si la finesse d’esprit ne consiste pas à s’abstenir de conclure ?*’ It is the part of men like this to protest against all extreme views, all patriotic illusions, to sit dispersed amid the countries of civilised men, and to try their hopes and creeds by an appeal to the laws of their own being, and to their own forgotten past.

‘*Ex necessitate est*,’ the old saying runs, ‘*ut sit aliquis philosophus in specie humanâ*.’ In order that humanity may be fully conscious of itself there must, we instinctively feel, be somewhere on earth a life disengaged from active or personal aims, and absorbed in the mere exercise of intellectual curiosity. And such a life, which sometimes seems to us to lie outside all human interests and emotions, will sometimes also appear as the centre of them all. For the universe in which man is placed so far transcends his power to grasp it, the destinies amidst which his future lies are so immense and so

obscure,—that the most diverse manners of bearing ourselves among them will in turn occupy our full sympathies, satisfy our changing ideal. Sometimes a life of action seems alone worthy of a man; we feel that we exist in vain unless we manage to leave some beneficent trace of our existence on the world around us; unless we enrich it with art, civilise it by education, extend it by discovery, pacify it with law. Sometimes, again, our relations to the Unseen will take possession of the soul; thought is lost in love, and emotion seems to find its natural outlet in spiritual aspiration and prayer. And there is a mood, again, in which all action, all emotion even, looks futile as the sport of a child; when it is enough to be a percipient atom swayed in the sea of things; when the one aim of the universe seems to be consciousness of itself, and all that is to exist only that it may at last be known.

There was a time when all these strains of feeling could coexist effectively in a single heart. Plato, 'the spectator of all time and of all existence,' was also the centre of the religion of the world. And if this can rarely be so now, it is not necessarily or always that saints and philosophers in themselves are smaller men, but rather that man's power of thought and emotion has not expanded in proportion to the vast increase of all that is to be felt and known. There has been a specialisation of emotions as well as of studies and industries; it has become necessary that what is gained in extension should in some degree be lost in intensity, and that the wisdom that comprehends the world should cease to be compatible with the faith that overcomes it.

Let us not, then, expect all things from any man. Let us welcome the best representative of every mood of the mind. And if the philosophic mood can scarcely find expression without some pitying consciousness of the ignorance and error which envelop the multitude of men, let us remember that this compassionating tone, though it can hardly be made agreeable to the mass of men, may nevertheless be most salutary. For so much knowledge is now diffused among men of ordinary education, that it is difficult to remain steadily conscious how small a fraction this is of what it imports us to know. It is not that we fail in admiration for eminent talents; never perhaps has eminent talent been more admired. But we cannot habitually realise to ourselves our incapacity to form true opinions; we decide where doctors disagree; we rush in where a Goethe has feared to tread. We have to make up our minds, we say, for we have to act. Be it so, but we must be content to be reminded that in that case our decision proves nothing, except that we were anxious to decide.

In the domain of the physical sciences we are less tempted thus rashly to dogmatise, and the blunders to which our dogmatism leads us are more easily seen. It is when we deal with questions affecting the inner being, the profounder beliefs of men, that we are able con-

tentedly to forget that these beliefs repose ultimately on historical and philological considerations with which we have made no effort to acquaint ourselves. Yet as the conception of science broadens and deepens, this apathy must pass away; and already during recent years there has been a marked awakening in the European mind, a growing perception that the historical sciences will prove to be as essential to our guidance through life as the physical sciences have already shown themselves to be. 'L'union de la philologie et de la philosophie,' says M. Renan, 'de l'érudition et de la pensée, devrait être le caractère du travail intellectuel de notre époque.' And again, 'C'est aux sciences de l'humanité qu'on demandera désormais les éléments des plus hautes spéculations.'

But desisting from further summary of discussions whose fulness and subtlety make them almost impossible to summarise, let us test, by a few concrete instances, the value of this philosophical outlook on contemporary history. M. Renan has lived in close contact with the French and German people, and with the 'Bretons bretonnants' who linger around his early home. Let us inquire if there be anything in his way of regarding these nations, which indicates a mind accustomed to an impartial weighing of the fates of men; anything beyond the conventional glorification of France, the conventional bitterness against Germany; anything which penetrates beneath surface characteristics to a race's true genius and essential power.

And inasmuch as philosophy is an aroma which should penetrate every leaflet of the trec, I will take my illustration of M. Renan's insight into the character of his own countrymen from a short article on the Theology of Béranger,²¹ called forth by the appearance of a family edition of the works of the poet of 'Lisette and Chambertin,' at first sight so ill-adapted for domestic perusal.

'De toutes les parties du système poétique de Béranger,' says M. Renan, after some admirable comments on the moral side of his poems, 'celle qui me surprit le plus, quand je le lus pour la première fois, ce fut sa théologie. Je connaissais peu alors l'esprit français; je ne savais pas les singulières alternatives de légèreté et de pesanteur, de timidité étroite et de folle témérité, qui sont un des traits de son caractère. Toutes mes idées furent troublées quand je vis que ce joyeux convive, que je m'étais figuré mécréant au premier chef, parlait de Dieu en langage fort arrêté, et engageait sa maîtresse à

Lever les yeux vers ce monde invisible

Où pour toujours nous nous réunissons.

'La naïveté toute bourgeoise de cette théologie d'un genre nouveau, cette façon de s'incliner le verre en main devant le Dieu que je cherchais avec tremblement, furent pour moi un trait de lumière. À l'indignation que me causa l'idée d'une confraternité religieuse avec ceux qui adorent de la sorte se mêla le sentiment de ce qu'il y a de fatalement limité dans les manières de voir et de sentir de la France. L'incurable médiocrité religieuse de ce grand pays, orthodoxe jusque dans sa gaieté, me fut révélée, et le Dieu des bons gens m'apparut comme l'éternel dieu gaulois contre lequel lutterait en vain toute tentative de philosophie et de religion épurée.'

²¹ In *Questions Contemporaines*.

And from this text he argues how closely akin are licence and bigotry; how it is the same spirit of contented shallowness which in each direction is impatient of modest self-restraint; which leads to easy vulgarity in the domain of morals, empty rhetoric in the domain of literature, ready and confident dogmatism in the domain of religion. To protest against each of these in turn has been the mission of M. Renan, and surely by no other example or exhortation could he have deserved better of France.

It is needless to say that he can also praise his country with grace and enthusiasm, though never with that monstrous adulation to which she is sometimes too willing to lend her ear. More remarkable is the generous candour with which, in the very shock and crisis of the war, when nothing was heard on either side but outrage and execration, the French philosopher did justice to the impulse which urged Germany to assert her unity and her place among great nations.²²

S'il y a une nationalité qui ait un droit évident d'exister en toute son indépendance, c'est assurément la nationalité allemande. L'Allemagne a le meilleur titre national, je veux dire un rôle historique de première importance, une âme, une littérature, des hommes de génie, une conception particulière des choses divines et humaines. L'Allemagne a fait la plus importante révolution des temps modernes, la Réforme; en outre, depuis un siècle, l'Allemagne a produit un des plus beaux développements intellectuels qu'il y ait jamais eu, un développement qui a, si j'ose le dire, ajouté un degré de plus à l'esprit humain en profondeur et en étendue, si bien que ceux qui n'ont pas participé à cette culture nouvelle sont à ceux qui l'ont traversée comme celui qui ne connaît que les mathématiques élémentaires est à celui qui connaît le calcul différentiel.

He proceeds to draw a picture of what united Germany might become, the Prussian leaven disappearing when it has leavened the whole lump, and leaving a nation open, perhaps, beyond any other, to the things of the spirit; more capable, perhaps, than any other of founding a State organisation on a scientific and rational basis. And he concludes with a dignified appeal to the moral intervention of Europe in the present extremity, a dignified protest against the dismemberment and degradation of France.

On reading the letter to M. Strauss, from which this passage is taken, a letter full of large general views and scrupulous candour, one is tempted to think that it must be an easy thing for a professed philosopher to retain his philosophy even, as the ancients said, 'when earth is mixed with fire.' A curious incident to which this correspondence gave rise may be quoted, however, as showing how difficult it is in these moments of excitement, even for the controversialist whose arguments are supported by thirty legions, to maintain a tone on which he can afterwards look back with satisfaction. The correspondence in question was begun by M. Strauss, who addressed a letter to M. Renan in the *Augsburg Gazette* of the 18th of August, 1870.

²² *Lettre à M. Strauss.*

M. Renan caused a translation of this letter to appear in the *Journal des Débats* of the 15th of September,—no easy matter, as may be supposed, in that fury of rage against Germany; and, on the 16th of September appeared M. Renan's own reply. The *Augsburg Gazette* refused to insert this reply of M. Renan's; and perhaps no one circumstance was more significant than this of the temper of Germany at the time. There was not a word (it is needless to say) in M. Renan's letter which could give just offence; but, nevertheless, the organ of the victorious nation, having itself challenged a discussion, refused to insert the courteous reply of the vanquished party. It might have been thought that under these circumstances M. Strauss would withdraw with displeasure from his connection with a newspaper which took this view of what was fair and honourable. But it was not so. On the contrary, he wrote a reply to M. Renan's letter, and inserted it in the *Augsburg Gazette* on the 2nd of October, 1870, at a time when the Prussian blockade of Paris of course prevented M. Renan from receiving the newspaper. By this ingenious method of controversy, M. Strauss was able to appear to challenge a champion of the opposite side to an impartial discussion, then to permit the suppression of that champion's reply; then to write to him again in a still more violent tone (with misrepresentations on which I need not dwell), and to choose a moment for this rejoinder when his antagonist could not possibly receive or reply to it. All this he did as one philosopher communing with another philosopher, and with the consciousness that he belonged to an entirely virtuous nation, which was justly chastising a nation sunk in ignorance and corruption.

I have said that M. Strauss permitted the suppression in the *Augsburg Gazette* of M. Renan's letter. He chose, however, to give it to the world in another fashion. He translated it into German and published it, along with his own two letters, for the benefit of a German military infirmary.

The *Nouvelle lettre à M. Strauss* (September 1871) in which M. Renan gently recounts these transactions, and indicates some particulars in which the great German people may seem still to fall short of perfection, affords perhaps as good an instance as this century has to show of the sarcastic power of the French language in hands that can evoke its subtleties and manœuvre its trenchant blade. The paragraph which I quote below appears as if its only anxiety were to make excuses for M. Strauss. But it would be hard to find any passage since Pope's 'Atticus' which it would be more disagreeable to have addressed to one.

Il est vrai que vous m'avez fait ensuite un honneur auquel je suis sensible comme je le dois. Vous avez traduit vous-même ma réponse, et l'avez réunie dans une brochure à vos deux lettres. Vous avez voulu que cette brochure se vendît au profit d'un établissement d'invalides allemands. Dieu me garde de vous faire une chicane au point de vue de la propriété littéraire! L'œuvre à laquelle vous m'avez

fait contribuer est d'ailleurs une œuvre d'humanité, et si ma chétive prose a pu procurer quelques cigares à ceux qui ont pillé ma petite maison de Sèvres, je vous remercie de m'avoir fourni l'occasion de conformer ma conduite à quelques-uns des préceptes de Jésus que je crois les plus authentiques. Mais remarquez encore ces nuances légères. Certainement, si vous m'aviez permis de publier un écrit de vous, jamais, au grand jamais, je n'aurais eu l'idée d'en faire une édition au profit de notre Hôtel des Invalides. Le but vous entraîne; la passion vous empêche de voir ces mièvreries de gens blasés que nous appelons le goût et le tact.'

From the temper of mind which calls forth M. Renan's strongest expressions of repulsion,—this temper of domineering dogmatism and blind conceit,—let us pass to the opposite extreme. Let us turn to the race from which M. Renan sprang, the race whose character is traceable in all that he has written. The nationality of the romantic, emotional, unpractical Celt, surviving in his western isles and promontories from an age of less hurrying effort, less sternly moulded men, has fallen into the background of the modern world. Yet every now and then we are reminded—by some persistent loyalty, as in la Vendée, to a dethroned ideal; by some desperate incompatibility, as in Ireland, with the mechanism of modern progress—that there exists by our side a nation whose origin, language, memories, differ so profoundly from our own. M. Renan is a Celt who has become conscious of his Celtic nature; a man in whom French *savoir-vivre*, German science, are perpetually contending with alien and ineradicable habits of mind,—‘comme cet animal fabuleux de Ctésias, qui se mangeait les pattes sans s'en douter.’ This mixed nature, the result, as one may say, of a modern intelligence working on a temperament that belongs to a far-off past, and making of him ‘un romantique protestant contre le romantisme, un utopiste prêchant en politique le terre-à-terre, un idéaliste se donnant inutilement beaucoup de peine pour paraître bourgeois,’ has rendered M. Renan's works unintelligible and displeasing to many readers. ‘Twy-natured is no nature’ is the substance of many a comment on the great historian's union of effusive sympathy and destructive criticism. But there is a sense in which a man may be double-minded without being hypocritical, and the warp and woof of his nature, shot with different colours, may produce for this very reason a more delicate and changing charm. In his essay on Celtic poetry M. Renan has abandoned himself to his first predilections. Nowhere is he more unreservedly himself than when he is depicting that gentle romance, that half humorous sentiment, that devout and pensive peace, which breathe alike in Breton, in Welsh, in Irish legend, and which, after so many a journeying into the imaginary or the invisible world, find their truest earthly ideal in the monasteries of Iona or Lindisfarne. Here it is that we discern his spiritual kin; among these saints and dreamers whose fancy is often too unrestrained, their emotion too femininely sensitive, for commerce with

the world, these populations who to the faults inherent in weakness have too often added the faults that are begotten of oppression, but yet have never wholly sunk to commonness, nor desisted from an unworldly hope. There have been races which have had a firmer grasp of this life. There have been races which have risen on more steady and soaring wing when they would frame their conceptions of another. But there has been no race, perhaps, which has borne witness more unceasingly, by its weakness as by its strength, to that strange instinct in man's inner being which makes him feel himself as but a pilgrim here; which rejects as unsatisfying all of satisfaction that earth can bring, and demands an unknown consolation from an obscurely encompassing Power.

'O frères de la tribu obscure,' exclaims M. Renan, 'au foyer de laquelle je puisai la foi à l'invisible, humble clan de laboureurs et de marins, à qui je dois d'avoir conservé la vigueur de mon âme en un pays éteint, en un siècle sans espérance, vous errâtes sans doute sur ces mers enchantées où notre père Brandan cherchait la terre de promission; vous parcourûtes avec saint Patrice les cercles de ce monde que nos yeux ne savent plus voir. . . . Inutiles en ce monde, qui ne comprend que ce qui le dompte ou le sert, fuyons ensemble vers l'Éden splendide des joies de l'âme, celui-là même que nos saints virent dans leurs songes. Consolons-nous par nos chimères, par notre noblesse, par notre dédain. Qui sait si nos rêves, à nous, ne sont pas plus vrais que la réalité? Dieu m'est témoin, vieux pères, que ma seule joie, c'est que parfois je songe que je suis votre conscience, et que par moi vous arrivez à la vie et à la voix.'

Enough, perhaps, has now been said to give a general conception of the sum of powers and tendencies which M. Renan brings to bear on the complex problems of man's life and destiny. We have seen that his mind is stored with wide-reaching knowledge, thoroughly penetrated with the scientific spirit. We have seen at the same time that he is by instinct conservative; that his sympathies are aristocratic rather than democratic; but aristocratic in the highest sense, as desiring to fortify or replace the aristocracy of birth by an aristocracy of unselfish wisdom, which may serve as a barrier against the ignoble deference too often paid to wealth alone. We have seen, again, that this philosophy which he preaches is in himself no merely nominal or idle thing; but has enabled him not only to bear himself with dignified firmness under the mild persecution of modern days, but also—a harder achievement—to recognise, though a Frenchman, the faults of France, and in the crisis of an embittered struggle to admit with generous largeness the essential worth and mission of the foe. Lastly, we have traced his sympathies to their deeper roots, and have discerned in his vein of emotion—ever between a smile and a sigh—the latest self-expression of a gentle old-world race, the dreamy prophesyings of the Merlin of a later day.

We shall thus, it may be hoped, be better qualified to estimate (in a succeeding paper) M. Renan's views on those great matters to which

his thoughts have mainly turned ; man's position, namely, in the spiritual universe, as he has himself in different ages regarded it, or as to us it may now appear ; and especially the story, full of ever new interest and wonder, which tells how one conception of man's Creator and his destiny has overcome the rest, and one life of perfect beauty has become the model of the civilised world.

FREDERIC W. H. MYERS.

PAWNBROKING ABROAD AND AT HOME.

THE accumulative power of money is very great, and against it, when heaped up in large masses, society has always had to protect itself. Solon and Moses both forbade usury. The former allowed moderate rates of interest; the latter guarded against the evils of debt by including the debtor who had become his creditor's servant within the scope of the year of jubilee. The absolute ownership of the soil of the earth by individuals is a comparatively recent invention, so that in the olden days a man could rarely pledge more than his person or his property. The disorders of usury gave birth both in Greece and Italy to various remedies, of which the chief was the establishment of banks or money-changers' tables, at which loans could be had on the deposit of articles of value. The *τραπεζίται* of Athens were regarded as holding an honourable office, and at Alexandria rich men were urged, and even constrained, to deal in money and to lend to the public. As at Athens, the banker was regarded with esteem, and his office was hereditary. The Roman law condemned a robber to restore double the value of the article he had stolen; the usurer fourfold.¹ Cicero speaks² of the long-established 'tables' of the money-dealers; and to these, centuries before, the Consul Lævinus is related by Livy to have urged the senators themselves to carry their plate and jewels in order to raise funds for the expenses of the Punic war. There were also in Rome the *Mensæ Trallianorum*, kept by the natives of Tralles in Lydia, who especially affected this branch of business, and the *Mensæ Oleariæ*, at which oil, one of the prime necessities of life, was lent to the poor of the city.

In the early middle ages there seems to have been no effort made to check the ravages of the Jews and usurers. In the twelfth century the Lombards became known as money-dealers. Mention is made by Matthew Paris of a Papal Nuncio named Etienne, who was sent on a journey to collect money for the Pope from bishops, abbots, and priors under threat of excommunication if not paid on a certain day. The envoy had the happy idea of carrying with him a Lombard, or banker, who was prepared to buy or lend money on the security of the sacred vessels or other plate. The Lombards soon had their establishments

¹ *De re Rusticâ.*

² *Pro Cæciâ.*

in every part of Europe ; and it is not difficult to see what the connection in their business was between their trade in money and their trade in gold and silver plate and jewels. The forerunners of the great banking firms of the City were pawnbrokers before they were anything else.

In the middle of the fifteenth century the evils of usury had reached their greatest height. Most States had become deeply indebted to the Jews and to the Lombards. Vast numbers of families were ruined. The bankers received as much as sixty or eighty per cent. interest for their money, and in the end they almost always were able to appropriate the articles of value which had been deposited with them. Commerce was being ruined, and the wealth of individuals and of States was passing into the hands of the bankers.

It was as a remedy against some of these evils that the *Monte-di-pietà*³ was established. Nor let it be supposed that the remedy was ineffectual either in its scope or its extension. To Perugia belongs the honour of the invention of one of the most important of beneficent institutions of modern times. Towards the middle of the fifteenth century certain charitable persons of that town, touched by the misfortunes caused by Jews and usurers, collected a sum of money, which was lent out without interest, on the security of valuable articles deposited with them. The persons intended to be benefited were first the poor generally, but next the smaller merchants, dealers, tradesmen, and manufacturers. The boon conferred on the poorer Perugians was very great indeed. Whilst the distressed artisan was able to tide over a passing misfortune, without incurring the contamination of a charity which was then as now often contemptuously bestowed, the trader found in the *Monte-di-pietà* a secret and assured resource in a moment of commercial depression or any trade crisis. The inhabitants of Perugia were greatly relieved by the new institution, which attracted much attention throughout Italy. It is not too much to say that the tender-hearted and most wise charitableness of the cultured Perugians—the fellow-citizens of Pietro Perugino and Raphael—led them to effect a social revolution such as has seldom been surpassed for good.

The Church at once recognised the *Monte-di-pietà* as a work of charity, and the institution soon spread. Sixtus IV. established a *Monte-di-pietà* at Savona, his native city, by bull, in 1479. Private persons of wealth supplied the funds. Innocent VIII. set one up in 1488 at Cesena, or confirmed one which the inhabitants had already established. In the same year Mantua became possessed of a similar establishment. By this time the advantage of the institution was fully recognised, but considerable difficulty was experi-

* I have been unable to find any satisfactory derivation of this name ; Cerreti, writing at Padua in 1752, makes the same remark. It means simply a 'mountain of piety,'—or rather charity. The French speak of *piété envers les malheureux*.

enced in providing the necessary funds. The inhabitants of Padua having consulted several skilful doctors-of-law and theologians of that famous university as to the propriety of charging 5 per cent. interest, and the answers being favourable, established a *Monte-di-pietà* in 1491. The result of this step was that the Jews' banks, which charged 20 per cent., were shortly afterwards closed. The Florentine doctors, being applied to by their fellow-citizens, assured them that there was 'no sin, even venial,' in charging low interest to support a *Monte-di-pietà*, and thus in 1492 Florence also became the seat of one of these most useful institutions. The usurers, however, were not likely to submit tamely to the losses to which they were now subjected. Their chief source of profit, the oppression of the poor, was slipping away from them. They attacked the new establishments with acrimony, accusing their founders of being usurers under the guise of Christian philanthropists. The controversy, however, was brought to a close in 1539, when the Lateran Council solemnly approved the principle of the *Monte-di-pietà*.

Italy was the first home of the new institution, but France did not long lag behind in the good work. Avignon had a *Mont-de-piété* in 1577; Arras in 1624. Paris, however, which is now distinguished by the excellence of its *Mont-de-piété*, was without one until 1777. Dr. Cerreti of Padua, travelling in France in the middle of that century, expresses his astonishment that so necessary and important an institution should be wanting in the foremost city of the world, and the centre of civilisation. A similar feeling is experienced by those foreigners who, being acquainted with the beneficent action of the *Monts-de-piété* abroad, find, to their astonishment, that the poor of England, as well as the struggling small traders, are still subject to the same exactions as those from which the corresponding classes in France, in Italy, in Holland, in Belgium, in Germany and other countries have long since been set free.

Before proceeding to explain in detail the present position and method of working of the best *Monts-de-piété* in Europe, it is convenient that we should examine the general scope of these institutions; and that we should consider how far England, in which country alone the State takes upon itself the full charge of the indigent poor, is thereby excused for her apparent neglect in disregarding an institution which has received for centuries the universal and practical approval of foreign philanthropists.

As has been already hinted, the scope of the *Mont-de-piété*, or public pawnbroker's shop, is twofold; it supplies the temporary personal needs of the wage-earning classes, and also the temporary commercial embarrassments of small tradesmen and manufacturers. With regard to the first of these two classes, the advantage of possessing an unfailing resource close at hand in case of need is obvious. Those persons who have given much thought to the question of charitable relief, and the

best method of maintaining the independence of the poor, properly attach the highest importance to all efforts which enable them to dispense with external assistance. We have it stated on the highest authority that it is the giver who is blessed rather than the recipient. A favourite subject for the modern poet's idyl is the Lady Bountiful of the village, scattering blessings on all sides from her well-stocked purse and basket. The wise economist of the future will turn his back on such relics of feudal dependence, and will see true pathos, the groundwork of all poetry, in the visit of the working-man to the pawnshop, where he will find on easy terms the means by which he may ward off the passing effects of unavoidable calamity. It is impossible for the earner of wages to foresee and guard against all the ills of life. His friendly club will shelter him against sickness and perhaps old age. But in our present crowded state of population, waves of commercial depression must occasionally cause suffering by depriving even the best workmen of occupation for a time. The little hoard may soon become exhausted. Work and prosperity may be in sight, yet there may be a few days or weeks to be tided over before they actually come. This is the critical moment of the working-man's life. If only he can manage to pass through it without the contamination of public or the degradation of private charity, it will be indeed well for him. When a man has once tasted the sweets of either form of extraneous help, he has taken the first step downwards. It cannot, of course, be contended that such help can always be avoided. It is only asserted, in words as strong as human language can devise, that the philanthropist who has offered the working-man a means of self-escape from his dilemma without degrading him has deserved well of God and man.

It is not the object of the present article to decry a highly respectable body of men, the pawnbrokers of this country; most of them have the reputation of carrying on their business in an intelligent and honourable manner. But the interest which the law allows them to take from their customers is very high. There is, in fact, scarcely any limit to it, inasmuch as a special contract may be entered into between the pawnbroker and his customer by which the latter may undertake to pay, on loans of more than 2*l.*, any rate of interest that may be agreed upon. This special rate varies from 15 to 30 per cent. or even more. But if no such contract is made, the legal rate charged—in addition to 1*d.* for the ticket—is 25 per cent. per annum, or $\frac{1}{3}$ *d.* per month for every two shillings lent when the loan is 2*l.* or under, and 20 per cent. from 2*l.* to 10*l.* There can be no doubt whatever that, even on these onerous terms, the English pawnbrokers are a great advantage to many of their customers. Yet the price paid for the accommodation is so high that the working classes have a natural repugnance to making use of this resource. The pawn-shop is no *Mont-de-piété*. It is associated with the idea of dissipation,

drunkenness, unthrift, and recklessness. The man who is forced to pay such a rate of interest as that exacted must be indeed in a bad way.

This observation holds good still more strongly in the case of the small manufacturer who finds himself temporarily embarrassed. Dr. Cerreti pointed out that one of the main objects of the *Mont-de-piété* in Perugia was the relief of the dealer whose credit would be irretrievably shaken if he could not take up a bill of exchange for a small sum about to come due. By the deposit of some of his raw or half-worked-up material he was enabled to tide over the difficulty, obtaining the assistance he required with the utmost secrecy and without delay. But what would be thought of the English tradesman or petty manufacturer who had recourse to the pawnbroker under similar circumstances? The remedy would probably be worse than the disease. No business established on a firm foundation could stand a drain of 20 or 25 per cent. for temporary accommodation. The *Mont-de-piété* distinctly lays itself out for this class of business, and it is by no means certain that the good it effects by relieving the pressing necessities of the petty trader is not at least equal to that bestowed upon the suffering working class. We shall consider the danger of fraud in connection with this branch of the subject in its proper place. All that is insisted upon now is that in the *Mont-de-piété* those who carry on petty industries of various kinds find the same resource which dealers of a higher grade find in their bankers. Why should not a manufacturer on a small scale be able to rely on an advance on his goods in the same way as the City magnate raises money temporarily on dock-warrants or bills of lading?

That the principle of the *Mont-de-piété* should never have been recognised in England is quite of a piece with our public and compulsory system of relief of the poor. In theory, at least, there is no room for any such institution. Our Poor Law is framed with a view to help every indigent person throughout the length and breadth of the land. A man who is poor enough to pawn his shirt or his saw is poor enough to claim his right as a Briton to be assisted out of the public funds. But, although this is a very symmetrical theory, it very frequently breaks down in practice. It is fortunate for England that it does so. It would be a very serious matter for us if the people of this country were to make use of the Poor Law to the full extent of their undoubted right. As it is, they have made astonishing efforts to keep themselves free from its trammels. Their Friendly Societies, which are already achieving a great success, their use of Savings Banks of various kinds, and even the extent to which the existing costly pawnbroking system is used by the working classes, are proofs of the earnest desire which they feel to be independent and live self-contained lives. They stand, however, at a great disadvantage in comparison with the inhabitants of many other countries. The State, having discharged its theoretical duty to the indigent by imposing

upon itself the heavy burden of a Poor Law, does not see any room for further efforts in the same direction. Society at large thinks that it has done enough when it has paid its poor rates. This is why what may be called the scientific relief of the poor is a subject which until recently has been little studied in England. Whilst conferences are frequently held at Milan,⁴ at Paris, and at many other places on the best methods of relief, the subject has hitherto been put aside as settled once for all in England. Now, however, a change is taking place in public opinion, and the operations of the Poor Law are being greatly curtailed, chiefly through the restriction of out-door relief. Henceforward there will be more room for charity among us. But it must not be a falsely-called charity of doles and gifts. We must help the poor to help themselves. I do not know that any better way of helping them could be found than the establishment of a *Mont-de-piété* in each of our great centres of industry.

Within the last few months I have personally visited the *Monts-de-piété* of Paris, of Brussels, and of Amsterdam, and I have collected a mass of information on the subject, of which I now propose to give as extended a *résumé* as the limits of the space at my disposal will permit.

We take first the case of the *Monts-de-piété* of France: for although the institution is not originally of French growth, it has greatly flourished on French soil, is progressive, and may best be studied in that country. The *Mont-de-piété* of Paris is little more than a hundred years old, but it affords, both from the extent of its operations and its admirable organisation, an excellent example of what a charitable institution should be.

I have before me a copy of an unpublished report made by the General Inspection of the charitable establishments of France in 1876 to the Minister of the Interior. According to the French system exhaustive reports on this and similar subjects are made about every twenty-five years. In this document, then, we have the means of comparing fully the present condition of the *Monts-de-piété* with that of a quarter of a century ago.

There are in France forty-five of these establishments. If this number appears small, it must be remembered that they are only able to be established in the great centres of population, where a sufficient amount of business can be done to justify the heavy expenses which have to be borne. In Paris there are several branch establishments (*succursales*), and in some instances provincial *Monts-de-piété* have similar dependencies in neighbouring towns. Four new *Monts-de-piété* have been opened since 1851, one being situated in Algiers. Three have been closed in the same period, that of Dieppe having been suppressed in consequence of the bad conduct of an official,

⁴ September 1880.

whose defalcations plunged the institution into hopeless difficulties. In 1851 the capital employed—independent of buildings and plant—in the Monts-de-piété de France was nearly 30,000,000 francs, of which Paris engrossed 19,000,000. In 1876 these amounts had increased respectively to 68,000,000 and 43,500,000 francs. It will be observed that the operations of the Mont-de-piété of Paris are larger than those of all the other establishments in France put together.

In 1851 the total amount of loans in France rose to 37,500,000 francs on 2,600,000 articles deposited. In 1875, 77,000,000 francs were lent to nearly 4,000,000 borrowers.

The Mont-de-piété is not a State institution, but it enjoys State protection, and, being a monopoly, is free from private competition. The law recognises it as a 'work of public utility,' and as such bestows upon it certain privileges, the most tangible one being exemption from stamp-duty, and from registration of documents connected with the administration. A Mont-de-piété is permitted to be established only by decree of the President of the Republic, and with the consent of the local municipal council. The council of administration is presided over by the mayor of the commune; in Paris by the Préfet of the Seine. The members are appointed in Paris by the Minister of the Interior, in the departments by the Préfet, and must be taken one-third from the municipal council, one-third from the administrators of charitable associations, and one-third from other citizens resident in the commune. The councils are renewed by thirds each year.

The question of raising sufficient funds for carrying on the vast operations of the Monts-de-piété of France is surrounded with difficulty. The property possessed by them is seldom large, and frequently nothing, so that even rent has often to be paid for the buildings which they occupy. The seventy-seven millions of francs (say over three millions sterling) required for the service in 1876 was made up from various sources. The produce of property stood for between six and seven millions of francs. Rather more than three millions of francs were lent by various charitable establishments, by communes or by savings banks. The next item is composed of four and a quarter millions, which are deposited as a guarantee of fidelity by the officials of the Monts-de-piété. Rather more than one-third of a million is produced by articles which have been sold but not claimed. Lastly, nearly fifty-two millions, or about two-thirds of the whole, are raised by loan on the security of the Monts-de-piété themselves, which deservedly enjoy a high credit, as may be judged from the facility with which this large amount appears to be obtained. On the other hand, the interest paid for the use of the capital required is a heavy charge upon the institutions, and greatly restricts their utility. The rate of interest paid by the Mont-de-piété of Paris is 3·89 francs, in the rest of France 3·22 francs. The security is not that

of the institutions alone, but also that of the hospices with which they are connected. The lenders are generally small capitalists.

We come now to the rate of interest charged to the persons who pledge their property. It is very high in all save a few establishments which possess a large amount of capital. In Paris the rate is 9 per cent. in addition to one-half per cent. allowed in this and some other *Monts-de-piété*, to the official known as the *commissaire priseur*, or estimator of the articles pledged, whose functions will be presently described. The highest rate of interest is that of the newly created *Mont-de-piété* of Dunkerque; it is no less than 14 per cent. On the other hand, a large number of the establishments work at a rate as low as 6, 5, and even 4 per cent. In five places—Grenoble, Nice, Montpellier, Toulouse, and in the *fondation Masurel* at Lille—no interest is charged. But the operations of these *Monts-de-piété* are limited. At Nice, for instance, only about 100 advances are made, amounting in all to 6,000 francs. The operations of the *Mont-de-piété* of Paris are, as we have seen, very large indeed, and the organisation of the institution with its various dependencies in the suburbs is exceedingly perfect, yet it is compelled to charge the high rate of $9\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. in order to guarantee itself against loss. In spite of this rate, however, four-fifths of the operations are carried on at a loss; it is only the remaining fifth, comprising large advances, which not only covers the losses, but produces an actual profit on the whole.

It is perfectly well understood by the authorities that the principal point to be aimed at is a reduction of the high rate of interest now charged in too many establishments. If we look back to the state of affairs in 1851, we shall see that no small progress has been made in this respect during the last quarter of a century. We find, for instance, that the rate at Lunéville has been reduced from 18 to 9 per cent.; at Besançon from 12 to $9\frac{1}{2}$; at Nancy from 12 to 6; at Boulogne from 12 to 9; at Limoges from 12 to 8 per cent. Nor does this by any means exhaust the list of reductions. There is not a single instance of increase in the rate of interest charged.

There are various ways in which it is expected that this rate may be reduced; of these, allusion need only be made to two. It is thought that the increasing estimation in which the *Mont-de-piété* is held, as a work of true charity and as one of the best methods of assisting the poor without degrading them, will attract the attention of the wealthy. The gifts and legacies which they have hitherto received have been small, but they have greatly increased of late years. The value of the property increased from 2,699,807 francs in 1851, to 6,234,673 francs in 1876. But it is rather to another reform which is in full progress that the position of the *Monts-de-piété* will owe a material alteration. It is clear that it is of vital importance that these institutions which depend so largely upon borrowed capital should not be carried on at a loss, and in order to attain this end

they are obliged to set before themselves the object of making a profit. Originally the connection between the charitable institutions (*Assistance Publique*) and the *Monts-de-piété* was so close that the latter were regarded as merely branches of the former, and were compelled to hand over to them all the profits which they made. Already in 1851, however, twenty-seven *Monts-de-piété* had become independent of the other charitable establishments. In 1876 this number had increased to thirty-seven. One now divides its profits with the charities, and three—against nine in 1851—pay to the charitable institutions the whole of the gain they make. Inasmuch, however, as Paris is one of these three, about 60 per cent. of all the profits made by the *Monts-de-piété* in France is absorbed by the *Assistance Publique*. A great controversy has been carried on for some years past on this subject. The *Assistance* is the owner of the buildings in which the central *Mont-de-piété* operates, and is responsible for an enormous amount of borrowed capital. The managers of the former decline to allow that there is any sufficient reason given why they should surrender so considerable a source of income as that from which they expected to receive about half a million of francs in 1879–80. They contend that more good can be done to the poor with this sum, as expended by them, than by reducing the rate of interest. On the other hand, the directors of the *Mont-de-piété* of Paris argue that 5 per cent. being the legal rate of interest in France,⁵ it is improper that a public institution should be compelled to charge more, and that there is no truer charity than that which enables necessitous persons to help themselves. It is probable, then, that sooner or later the controversy will be decided in Paris as in the rest of France, and that the *Mont-de-piété* of the capital will find itself in possession of such an income as will enable it in time to amass capital enough to allow a reduction of the rate of interest to be made. Eventually it will become necessary to find some means of again disposing of these profits, for after a certain amount of capital has been realised, there will be no further need of the annual income. It may then properly recur to the charitable institutions.

A question of great importance which has been much discussed by the administrators of public charity in France, is that which relates to the lowest rate of interest that ought to be exacted from the clients of the *Monts-de-piété*. It is recognised that there is a real danger in making the rate too low. If it were either entirely or nearly gratuitous, considerable dangers would arise, for the advantages offered would be seized by many who were not really in a necessitous condition. On the other hand, the loan could be granted only after an inquiry which, however discreetly it might be conducted, would probably wound just susceptibilities, and destroy shaken credit, and, in any case, would cause to the borrower a delay which would be

⁵ Six per cent. in commerce.

incompatible with the necessity of his position. This delicacy of feeling towards the poor underlies all the dealings of French philanthropists with charitable questions, and is very greatly to be commended. Englishmen who are familiar only with the operations of the Paupers' Board-room and the Hospital Waiting-room have little idea of the extent to which it is practised in France. No better illustration of it could be found than in the unwillingness of the managers of the *Monts-de-piété* to permit an application for a loan to depend upon inquiries. The much-used English formula 'a deserving case' is comparatively unknown in France. The difficulty of successful inquiry is regarded as almost insurmountable. But if it is resolved on the one hand that all shall pay a fair rate of interest, on the other it is suggested by the *Inspection Générale* that a fund should be accumulated by every *Mont-de-piété* and placed at the disposal of the *Bureaux de Bienfaisance*. These associations are necessarily intimately acquainted with all the real poverty which exists within the sphere of their operations, and they would have no difficulty in disposing of this fund, either by a partial or by a complete release of the articles pawned by the very poor. There is indeed no more favourite or reasonable way of assisting the indigent than this. *La Maréchale Macmahon* devoted every year considerable sums, during the *Septennat*, to this purpose, and with great advantage to the poor. The admirable organisation and co-operation of the *Monts-de-piété* and of the *Bureaux de Bienfaisance* render the proper application of such funds an easy matter. There seems to be little doubt that, whilst gratuitous operations should be avoided by the *Mont-de-piété*, the establishment of such a fund as that suggested would enable relief to be afforded to the most indigent borrowers. There must necessarily be a large number of clients of every such establishment who, whilst it would be unfair to exclude them altogether from the power of borrowing on the security of articles of value, have no claim whatever to any gratuitous advantage. Standing in the office of a *Mont-de-piété* I watched the borrowers as they came up one by one to effect a loan. At last there came a fashionably dressed young woman who laid a pile of valuable jewellery before the official. In reply to my question, '*Est-ce une dame ou une demoiselle?*' my mentor replied, '*Elle est quelque chose entre les deux—nous avons une forte clientèle dans ce genre-là.*' Neither to this class nor to the student of the *Quartier Latin*, who, according to the *Figaro* (September 9, 1880), is just now greatly addicted to gambling, in which vice he is much aided by the *Monts-de-piété*, ought a loan *sur gage* to be anything but a dry matter of business. It ought not, however, to be supposed that even the vicious and the dissipated deserve no protection or consideration. These derive benefit from the *Mont-de-piété*, and are thus often enabled to escape from positions in which they would inevitably sink lower in the social

scale were it not for the chance—often the last one—of escape from complete degradation which is offered to them.

It is often assumed that *Monts-de-Piété* and pawnbrokers' shops afford great facilities for the disposal of stolen articles of value. The statistics given in the report of the *Inspection Générale* show that this is not the case. The police of France and all the agents of justice have the fullest possible power of communication with and surveillance over the *Monts-de-piété*. Whenever an object of value is stolen, inquiries are always instantly made by the owner, so that it may be assumed that full and reliable statistics are available. It appears that in 1872 the officers of justice seized in Paris 1,125 articles which had been pledged for 16,641 francs; there were, however, only 235 different transactions. In addition, the Administration of the *Monts-de-piété* spontaneously denounced either to the police or to the judicial authorities the suspicious character of transactions in which 143 articles had been pledged for 2,307 francs, as well as 188 articles on which 3,733 francs had been promised but not actually handed over. Lastly, by means of a service of organised surveillance which exists not only in Paris but in all the great towns, the *Monts-de-piété* of Paris had restored 35 stolen watches, which had been pledged for 990 francs, to their legitimate owners. The total of 1,491 articles stolen, or suspected of having been stolen, and pledged for 23,671 francs, can hardly be considered excessive in view of the fact that in the same year 1,430,974 articles were pledged for 28,019,549 francs. The proportion of such transactions is about 1 in 1000, and 85 centimes in 1000 francs. The general result of the strict surveillance exercised both within and without the *Monts-de-piété* tends to show that thieves prefer, as a rule, to sell the spoil to receivers of stolen goods, although these would undoubtedly pay them far less than they would get on loan if they dared to approach the public establishment. It is greatly to be feared that the English system is far more favourable to dishonesty. It is, however, impossible to procure any statistics upon the subject. The only information at hand is that which is derived from the police reports in the daily papers, from which it would seem certain that our thieves are by no means so much afraid of the pawnbroker as the corresponding class in France is of the *Mont-de-piété*.

The *Mont-de-piété* being a charitable institution, it is regarded as a matter of primary importance that as large a sum as possible should be lent to the borrower who is compelled to have recourse to this method of relieving his necessities. What could be more painful than the discovery at the last moment that the sacrifice he has determined to make is insufficient to give him the means of escape from his embarrassment? The method of fixing the value is a simple one, but has a tendency to act against the borrower. A *commissaire-priseur*, who acts as valuer, is attached to every esta-

blishment, and is an intermediate agent who stands between the institution and the public. He fixes the amount to be advanced, and if the article is not redeemed, it is sold, and he has to make up any loss which may have accrued. On the other hand, any excess realised goes to the owner, who may claim it within three years. This excess is technically known as the *boni*, and if not claimed reverts to the establishment at the end of the period named.

As may easily be supposed, the inconvenience of having only one establishment in so great a city as Paris has not escaped attention. On its original foundation the attempt was made to confine all business to the central bureau, but in a very short time it was found that *commissionnaires* were transacting a considerable portion of the business. An attempt was made to put these down, but without success. They are now legally recognised, and are attached to *succursales*, or branch establishments, in various parts of Paris. The commissioners are limited to twelve in number, and they now transact only one-fourth of the business of the Mont-de-piété. They are placed under very strict regulations, having to furnish guarantees of fidelity and being severely punished in case of any infraction of the rules. The commission they receive is 2 per cent. of the loan advanced by the central establishment, and 1 per cent. for renewals or releases (*dégagements*). Originally these commissioners were merely agents acting on the one hand for the Mont-de-piété, and on the other for the borrower, but the impatience of pressing necessity obliged them to make immediate advances. These are generally higher than the sums lent by the central office, and the excess is known as the *différence*, on which the commissioner charges 6 per cent. interest. I was told that a short time before my visit to the head office some diamonds on which the *appréciateur* had offered 6,000 francs had been pledged at a *succursale* for 8,000 francs. The commissioner who undertook the transaction would thus receive 2 per cent. francs of commission on 6,000 francs, and 6 per cent. interest on the remainder. He would run the risk, however, of making a loss if the jewels were eventually sold at less than the amount advanced. Every article pledged in Paris is removed for safe custody to the central Mont-de-piété in the neighbourhood of the Halles Centrales. It is hardly necessary to say that in the vast warehouses where the property of the poor is stored up, the utmost order prevails, and the greatest precautions are taken against fire, any loss by which would fall upon the Assistance Publique. In spite of the elaborate system of *succursales*, and the assiduous care which is taken to treat the borrower with consideration and the least possible delay, it is a fact that a not inconsiderable illicit lending trade is carried on by many of the inferior tradesmen, principally jewellers, in Paris. For some inscrutable reason the very poor often have an idea that an institution of a public character is likely to

take some unknown advantage of them. The more ignorant of them prefer to place themselves in the hands of men who will certainly rob them. It is probable, however, that the evil complained of, though real, is not very extensive.

The rate at which loans are estimated at the central bureau is fixed at four-fifths of the intrinsic value of plate and gold, or articles composed of the precious metals. No allowance is professedly made for the artist's skill, which is regarded as too indefinite to be valued by the ordinary *appréciateur*. Other objects are accepted at two-thirds of their value. As an instance of the extraordinary skill to which the *appréciateurs* attain, I may mention that the official valuers in the chief offices of Paris, Brussels, and Amsterdam put exactly the same value upon a watch which I exhibited to them as a test. Of course it may be said that I was not a genuine borrower, as I was in each case obviously a mere dilettante inquirer; but it must be allowed that the agreement as to value was something more than a coincidence.

A discussion of considerable interest has recently taken place in Paris on the question of the possibility of including securities (*titres*) among the objects on which the Mont-de-piété might be authorised to make advances. One of the great aims of French statesmen has been, for many years past, to draw the people into the charmed circle of owners of property. In order to effect this, the public funds and a large proportion of the stock of public companies is divided (*fractionné*) to such an extent that even the smallest capitalists in remote villages are enabled to aspire at something higher than, as in England, a deposit in a savings bank, open once a week on market day for a couple of hours, and yielding $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. interest. Thus large numbers of Frenchmen are possessors of the securities which represent small incomes. Such persons may occasionally need a temporary advance. Could not the Mont-de-piété lend it to the owner of a satisfactory security of this class? It has been decided that the special knowledge required for such an addition to the business of the Mont-de-piété could not easily be acquired by the existing staff of officials, and that it must therefore be declined.

The discussion, however, suggests a number of questions to an Englishman. Why should the British small capitalist have been so long kept out of the means of making small investments? Why should it be impossible for an Englishman or Scotchman to obtain an advance on movable property of value without discredit? A nobleman in distress may pawn his acres without losing caste, but a farmer, a tradesman, or a labourer must not think of raising five or ten pounds on the plate or jewellery he possesses. Closely connected with this subject is that of loan offices, which, in such seasons as those which have recently occurred, have been driving a roaring trade. Throughout the length and breadth of the land, both town and country are placarded

with invitations to the necessitous to borrow money 'without publicity or security.' Columns of the London and provincial daily papers are daily filled with advertisements of the same mendacious character. The absence of publicity means the publication of a bill of sale in the *London Gazette*. The security required being generally that of stock, growing crops, furniture and farm implements, or stock in trade in the case of shopkeepers, is such as should enable a borrower to obtain a loan at 5 per cent.; the rate of interest charged varies from 20 or 30 per cent. to 80 or 100. The Joint Stock banks have done much to diminish the evil, but they work mainly on the principle of giving an advance to a fairly substantial man in need of temporary assistance, covered by one or two sureties of a solid character. The conditions are thus harder to fulfil than those of a loan office, for few farmers or tradesmen care to expose their affairs to the gaze of others—indeed it would be generally imprudent to do so. The evil of the loan offices is a gigantic one, and is greatly aggravated in the country by the right of landlords to priority in the case of rent. The abolition of the power of distraint in their case would not, indeed, remove the difficulty felt by farmers who desire to raise a loan, but it would alleviate it. What is needed is the establishment of banks of the people, of *Monts-de-piété*, and of similar institutions where the first care should be taken of the interests of the borrower, rather than of those who desire to make a large profit out of the necessities of others. French economists are at the present moment discussing the possibility of founding a bank, or branch of the *Mont-de-piété*, which should offer facilities to agriculturists for raising money on equitable terms on the security of their growing crops.

The statutes of the *Monts-de-piété* generally fix the minimum of the sum that can be advanced. It varies from 1 to 3 francs. At Nantes it is fixed at the high rate of 6 francs. Only 15 *Monts-de-piété* are bound to limit the maximum of a loan. At Paris the limit is 10,000 francs; the rule of 500 francs in the *succursales* is frequently broken. At Lille the amount is 6,000 francs; at Toulouse, Brest, and Roubaix, 3,000, at Dunkerque and Nîmes 500, at Angers only 40 francs. During the last ten years the gratuitous branch (*fondation Masurel*) of the Lille *Mont-de-piété*, which is one of the few establishments in France that do not charge any interest at all, has raised its maximum progressively from 30 to 150 francs. It is clear that a *Mont-de-piété* might sometimes be placed in an embarrassing position if no rule existed as to a maximum, as it might be called upon to advance sums which were beyond its power. On the other hand, the law gives to these institutions, in most of the countries in which they are established, the monopoly of the business of lending money upon pledges, and it is an obvious injustice to the borrower to turn him away from the door on the ground that the resources of the establishment are insufficient to meet his demand.

He then has no other resource than to apply to those illicit lenders who are sure to spring up wherever there is a demand for them, and to submit to their extortion. The law thus becomes indirectly an instrument of injustice. This does not, however, often occur, for it is to the interest of the Mont-de-piété to encourage the large transactions which alone bring in a profit.

The interests of the borrowers are carefully looked after. The law permits the owners of pledges to require their sale by the Mont-de-Piété at public auction three months after the original loan was effected, and a year or thereabouts before they would be sold in the natural course of events. The object of this regulation is to diminish the traffic in pawn-tickets (*reconnaissances*), which, although not illegal, is generally disadvantageous to the owner of the property pledged. The advantage of being able to insist upon the immediate sale of the articles pledged is evident. If, after three months or longer, the owner finds it improbable or undesirable that he should ever redeem his property, he can at once realise the difference between the amount for which it was pledged and its selling value. New merchandise, however, can only be sold at the end of a year; a wise regulation made in order to avoid the conversion of the Mont-de-piété into an ordinary establishment for the reception and sale of goods.

The average of loans on pledges throughout France rose from 14 francs 46 centimes in 1851 to 19 francs 44 centimes in 1875. In Paris the average in the latter year was 22 francs. The following table shows the very extensive use made of the institution by the poorer classes of the population :

Class of loan					Average amount of loan in each class	Proportionate number of loans	Proportionate amount of loans
					Francs	Per cent.	Per cent.
Under	5 francs	.	.	.	3	27·47	4·77
From	5 to 10 francs	.	.	.	7	40·85	15·14
"	11 " 25	"	.	.	17	16·91	14·10
"	26 " 50	"	.	.	38	8·18	16·67
"	51 " 100	"	.	.	73	4·41	18·43
"	101 " 500	"	.	.	194	2·04	21·00
"	501 " 1,000	"	.	.	728	0·08	2·92
Over	1,000 francs	.	.	.	2,947	0·06	6·97
					—	100 frs.	100 frs.

This table (which relates to all France) is singularly instructive. It will be observed that nearly 95 per cent. of the loans are for 50 francs (2*l.*) or under. It is fair to assume that a similar average prevails in England. The English law allows pawnbrokers, as we have seen, to charge 25 per cent. interest, as well as a small sum for the ticket, upon all advances on pledges for forty shillings and under. It is only when the amount is higher that the rate is reduced, so that

the poorer a borrower is the more he has to pay. This reflection should alone excite grave doubts in the minds of philanthropists as to whether the example set by so many foreign countries should not be followed by us. The fact that all but a minute number of borrowers bring, in their poverty, only objects of small value is a clear proof of the great value of the institution.

As we have seen, a certain fixed proportion of the selling value of articles pledged is advanced. Thus, on plate worth 75 francs and clothes worth 60—in all 135 francs—only 100 francs would be lent. It is clear, therefore, that large sums would accrue in case a considerable number of pledges were left unredeemed. And this, in fact, is the case. In 1875 the amount due to the *Monts-de-piété* on the pledges left on their hands was 4,465,495 francs. When these were sold by auction as the law directs, they realised 1,186,951 francs beyond that sum. The law requires that every pledge should be kept for one year and three months from the date of the original loan. It is then sold by auction, but the *boni*, or profit, if any, does not become the property of the establishment for three years; at any time within that limit it may be claimed by the owner. There were in 1875 nearly 4,000,000 borrowers or separate transactions. Pledges were taken out of pawn by 2,744,611 persons. The loans were renewed by the payment of interest in 1,036,046 cases. About 200,000 pledges were sold. But nearly 134,000 of the owners of the last came forward to claim the balance of the value of their property; the amount of *bonis* paid to the rightful owners being no less than 845,888 francs. The value of *bonis* confiscated in the same year was 382,327 francs, which formed a large portion of the total profits of the *Monts-de-piété*. The losses on the sale of pledges in 1875 were 179,417 francs, but as these were borne by the *commissaires-priseurs*, they do not enter into the account. The English law is more severe upon the poor. The same period of three years from the commencement of the transaction is allowed, during which the pledger is entitled to demand payment of any sum which may have been realised on the sale of the pledge beyond the sum due to the pawnbroker, who is allowed to sell only by auction. It would be interesting to know what number of pledgers use their right of inspecting the books of the pawnbrokers, and of claiming the balance, if any, due to them. There are, however, no statistics available. The English law gives the pawnbroker the absolute ownership of all pledges of less than ten shillings which remain unredeemed beyond a year and seven days. Now it will be seen by the table printed above that over 68 per cent. of the transactions in France are for sums of 10 francs and under. It may be certainly assumed that at least this proportion of the pledges taken in England are for less than 10 shillings. Thus, then, in a large majority of cases, English pledgers are deprived of the privileges which are accorded to all in France, and to

the owners of more valuable pledges in their own country. If the English law had prevailed in France, the surplus value of over 91,000 pledges would have been lost in 1875. The gross profit on sales is 35 per cent. on the amount advanced, so that if about the same average is gained in England our pawnbrokers must have in the item of confiscation alone a large addition to their already not inconsiderable earnings. Under the English system the *Monts-de-piété* would have gained in 1875 nearly one-fifth, or 20 per cent., of the *bonis* which were claimed by the rightful owners, in addition to the 382,327 properly confiscated. In concluding this branch of the subject it may be stated that in most *Monts-de-piété* the period for which the loan is granted is one year; in six it is only for six months; in a few cases the term is much longer, and in one (Beaucaire) reaches two years. When the period has expired, it can be renewed on payment of the interest, and, if necessary, a revaluation of the object. So carefully are the interests of the owners of pledges looked after that, in the case of a profit of a franc or upwards having been made on the sale of a pledge, a letter is forwarded to the address of the pawnier to inform him of the fact.

In order to avoid as far as possible all irregularities, the person who presents himself with an object to pledge is obliged to show that he is *connu et domicilié*, that is to say, he must prove his identity by means of his *carte de séjour* or other papers; or, in case he is unable to do this, he must be accompanied by another person who is himself *connu et domicilié*. There is no reason to suppose that this regulation presses hardly on the poor, who always have the means of identification in France ready at hand.

Any value which may attach to this sketch of a most useful, flourishing, and progressive institution is greatly enhanced, as I venture to think, by the statistics which are included in it, and which throw light, not only on the habits and rights of French, but also of English, pledgers. As they have never yet been published in this country,⁶ it is not perhaps unfair to assume that they should influence

⁶ Nor has the information on which this article is mainly based been published in France. I am indebted for the Report of the Inspection Générale to M. A. Chevalier, Chef des Services Administratifs de l'Assistance Publique. I trust the egotism may be pardoned which prompts me to print a portion of a letter which I received from the most competent authority on the subject in France in reference to an article published in this Review in March 1879, on 'The Poor in France:—

'Ministère de l'Intérieur, Paris, le 17 août 1879.

'Monsieur,— . . . J'ai reçu, en mars dernier, votre très-intéressant article sur les Pauvres de France, et je me le suis fait traduire pour mieux m'en rendre compte. Vous avez parfaitement exposé le système de l'assistance appliqué en France, et j'ai été très flatté de voir qu'en le comparant avec le système anglais, vous aviez la loyauté de reconnaître qu'il était préférable au vôtre. Je vous remercie d'un aveu qui fait honneur à votre franchise, bien qu'il ait dû coûter à votre patriotisme. Agréé, monsieur, l'assurance des sentiments les plus distingués de votre dévoué

'A. CHEVALIER.'

the legislature in one or two important points when it is called upon to revise the existing law. There can be no doubt that the rate of interest—25 per cent.—is too high, and that the confiscation of probably three-fourths of the unredeemed pledges at the end of a year presses hardly upon the poor.

The Belgian charities are in many respects similar to that of France, but are more liberal. We find that the Mont-de-piété is, on the whole, easier in its terms in dealing with the necessitous. The establishment at Brussels is an institution of great importance, and is well worthy of study; it is not, however, necessary to do more than point out the leading features of the system and a few of the results obtained.

By a law of April 1848, the Monts-de-piété of Belgium were re-organised. In default of endowment, these institutions are dependent upon the public charitable associations, which are expected to provide them with the necessary funds. If these are insufficient, the communal authorities are called upon to make up the difference. If the resources of the latter do not permit them to make any advance, and if neither the province nor the State can be induced to make a subsidy, the Mont-de-piété is suppressed by royal decree. From this it will be seen that there is a close connection between these institutions and the State in Belgium, although they are obliged to depend in a great measure upon themselves.

The funds possessed by the Mont-de-piété of Brussels, which was originally founded in 1618, are large. It will be observed that a very small amount is borrowed at interest. The following was the income of the establishment in a recent year:—

	Francs
Capitaux propres au Mont-de-piété	1,283,620
Avancés par les Bureaux de Bienfaisance	699,077
Versés par les Hospices	1,449,626
Versés par les Communes	7,745
Avancés par la Banque	100,000
Cautiounnements	177,500
Intérêts des capitaux avancés.	6,885
Boni des gages vendus (which can be claimed within two years after the expiration of the original fourteen months)	24,586
Total	3,749,048

This amount, equal to 150,000*l.*, is the capital with which the institution works. In the year alluded to 4,660,660 francs were advanced on 277,081 pledges. Of these, only 8,986 pledges were left unredeemed at the expiration of the legal limit of fourteen months. The amount advanced on new merchandise, on which no more than 1,000 francs can be lent, was 191,874 francs on 1,429 pledges. The limit in the case of other property is 3,000 francs, but this may be exceeded in exceptional cases.

There are three *succursales* or dependencies in Brussels, but all

pledges are brought on the second day to the central establishment, which is a large and fine building, and presents the appearance of a government office. As in France, considerable care is taken not to advance money to any but the rightful owner of the objects presented, or to his accredited agent. I saw a workman who brought some rings sent away to procure an authorisation from the possessor. Otherwise the business is transacted rapidly, a couple of minutes being often sufficient to complete the loan, as soon as the applicant's turn arrives. The officials are of opinion that it is not the working classes who mainly bring business to the *Mont-de-piété*; it is rather the classes immediately above them which feel the pressure of sudden necessity, and are in possession of objects which are worth pawning. The rate of interest charged in Belgium is 7 per cent., which is sometimes reduced to 6 per cent. The profits made are added to the capital. In case of loss of the article pledged, it is made up at its full value. Instalments are received on account, as in French *Monts-de-piété*.

As we travel northwards, we find that the efforts made on behalf of the poor are more energetic and extensive. In Amsterdam, the charitable institutions are on a vast, lavish scale, with the result of creating no small amount of the pauperism which they profess to relieve. This reproach does not, however, attach to the *Mont-de-piété* of Amsterdam, which fitly enjoys the credit of being one of the best managed institutions of the kind in Europe. The central office has nine dependencies in Amsterdam, and the tenth is being built. There are *Monts-de-piété* in the Hague, Utrecht, Rotterdam, and also in some smaller places. The nucleus of the working capital of the institution in Amsterdam is a sum of 500,000 florins (about 1,000,000 francs, or 40,000*l.*) The 'caution' money of all the employés of the town, amounting to 200,000 florins, swells the capital, and an average of 200,000 florins is borrowed. The rate of interest (which has been recently reduced) charged for loans between 40 cents (8*d.*) and 1,000 florins is 10 per cent.; above that amount 8 per cent. Considerable gains (an average of about 4 per cent.) accrue to the institution.

No less than 75 per cent. of the advances made are upon gold and diamonds. The benefits of the institution are much used by tradesmen, and especially by the smaller diamond merchants. There is a special office for the accommodation of persons who desire to borrow more than 100 florins, and prefer to transact their business with the greatest possible privacy. Among the articles on which advances are refused are the following:—

- Property that is not personal (*immeubles, onroerende goederen*).
- Ornaments and other objects belonging to the service of the church.
- Military articles, and arms.
- Bibles or church books marked with the names of societies.
- Wet linen.

Workmen's tools and utensils.

Obligations, shares, and similar securities are not accepted as pledges ; but in case of an unusual abundance of money the managers are allowed to advance money on such securities at the exchange.

Loans on gold and silver objects and on pearls and jewels on which more than 100 florins (200 francs = 8*l.*) are borrowed, are managed by specially appointed officials.

In times of epidemics clothing is only taken in pledge when proof is given that there is no danger from infection.

The lowest amount lent is 40 cents (8*d.*), the highest 10,000 fl. (1,000*l.*)

There is also a small charge, beginning as low as one centime, or the fifth of a penny, made for the costs of administration. On the back of every ticket is a table of interest by which it is easy to reckon the exact amount due. Interest is charged by the day, and not as in England for not less than fourteen days or periods of fourteen days.

The Mont-de-piété of Amsterdam (Stads-Bank van Leening te Amsterdam) is a municipal institution managed by five commissioners appointed by the town council. The total amount lent in 1878 was 2,493,542 florins, which are equal to just double the number of francs, or about 200,000*l.* The number of pledges was 567,963, and it may be noticed as an interesting statistic that the largest amount ever out at one time was not much more than one-third the total sum lent during the year. Nearly one-fourth of the pledges were pawned for less than one florin.

The general management of the Bank van Leening is similar to that of France and Belgium. Its existence, however, appears to be more assured, inasmuch as its capital consists, as we have seen, in the first place, of loans from other institutions or private individuals, next of the caution-money of officials ; but finally the municipality makes up the whole amount that is necessary for the working of the institution, however large the sum may be. It receives the net profits, which amounted in 1878 to 31,667 florins ; an arrangement which cannot be objected to in view of the fact that the town is responsible for this and other charitable institutions.

An account of the Monts-de-piété of the Continent would seem to be incomplete without some notice of the institution in Italy, the land of its birth. It is to be feared, however, that while the endowments of the Monti-di-pietà of Rome and other towns are richer than in any other country, the administration has greatly degenerated in common with those of many other of the charitable institutions of the country. The generally reliable Italian correspondent of the *Pall Mall Gazette* recently wrote as follows :—

Milan figures best in the scale of bad administrators of the patrimony of the poor, and yet even here scarcely an institution carries out faithfully the intention of the founders. Take, for instance, the *Monte-di-pietà*, or pawnshop. According to the statute, 'this institution is to assist all who are compelled by necessity to seek immediate assistance in money on moderate terms. If any sum remain after

all demands for money lent on the goods are complied with, loans may be made in other forms.' But looking into the accounts of the *monte*, one finds that with a capital of fifteen millions, only two millions are applied in the manner last indicated, and this, between one expense and another, at the enormous interest of 10 per cent., whereas the remaining thirteen millions are loaned out on mortgage or against good securities at 5 per cent. This is but an example. The so-called *Monti-di-piètà* are in reality mountains of injustice, fraud, and oppression. In small towns and rural districts, for instance, where people can neither read nor write, the pledgers often forget when the exact time expires, and, when they present themselves with the pawn-tickets, find that their cooking utensils, their bits of homespun linen, or what not, have been sold at far below their real value.

I am compelled to admit that a long personal experience of Italian affairs leads me to believe that this is probably an accurate picture. Under these circumstances it has seemed to me advisable to take the French Mont-de-piété rather than the Italian as the model for imitation.

In Spain the institution is not unknown, but according to a recent report, alluded to by M. Claveau as having been published by the Mont-de-piété of Madrid, there is no restraint upon private pawn-shops. The results are deplorable; the proprietors of the latter succeeding in exacting from borrowers, by means of various arithmetical artifices (*con su aritmética peculiar de ajustar los intereses por mensualidades*) as much as 60 or 70 per cent.

M. Henri Richelot, the writer of the article on Monts-de-piété in the *Dictionnaire de l'Administration Française*, gives a brief but interesting account of the institution as it exists in Prussia. In that country they are dependent on the commune and are associated with the savings banks. Berlin has even a royal Mont-de-piété.

In times of popular distress, the State sometimes organises loan-offices (*Darlehnkassen*), when either no pledge is required or one which cannot be deposited. Since 1869, the law permits any person to open a pawn-shop, but he is under the surveillance of the local authority, and his license may be withdrawn if it be found that he has been guilty of excessive charges, or any offence against public order.

In Austria and Bavaria a Mont-de-piété, or a pawn-shop, can only be opened when authorised by the authorities.

Is it possible, and, if possible, is it advisable, to transplant the institution which has been described to English soil? I believe that an affirmative answer may be given to both parts of this question.

The first difficulty would, of course, consist in finding the capital necessary to establish a Mont-de-piété, the seat of whose operations should be, to begin with, in London. We have no municipality which would be willing, as in Amsterdam, to put down 40,000*l.* to start the good work. Although we might, perhaps, look to the wealthy corporation of the City of London to make a loan of, say half that amount on similar terms, we shall no doubt be wiser to leave

any such help out of the account. The basis on which we may fairly start our proposal is the fact that, of the forty-three and a half millions of francs employed in Paris in a single year, forty-one millions were borrowed from the general public, mainly on the security of the concern and the vast property committed to its charge. It is true, indeed, that the Assistance Publique is likewise responsible for the debts of the Mont-de-piété, but it may be held that the real security consists in the pledges held by the establishment. The whole of the above amount was not required at one time, and the rate of interest averaged something under 4 per cent. Let us assume that a number of benevolent Englishmen desired to try the experiment of establishing a Mont-de-piété in London. I apprehend that the following might be regarded as something like the best *modus operandi*:—A hundred persons should agree (as is always done in France when a Mont-de-piété is started) to guarantee a sum of 1,000*l.* each; or two hundred 500*l.* each, of which only one-fifth should be paid up at once without interest. These should be shareholders in a limited liability company, and their risk would not therefore go beyond the 1,000*l.* or 500*l.* advanced. If thought advisable I am convinced that the concern could even afford to pay interest to the guarantors. When operations are commenced and half the capital in hand—10,000*l.*—has been advanced to pledgers, a sum of, say 8,000*l.*, may be borrowed on debentures at probably 4 per cent., or perhaps 5 per cent., until the confidence of the public had been gained. As transactions increase, the property of the Mont-de-piété would increase, and therefore *pari passu* the power of issuing debentures; for it must be remembered that, adopting the foreign system, no advance would be made exceeding four-fifths or three-fourths respectively of the easily realisable value of the different classes of property. If the institution flourished, it might be expected that in a few years the balance sheet of capital would stand thus:—

Guarantors' advance	£20,000
Borrowed on debentures	100,000
Total	£120,000

and in a very short time longer a profit would begin to accrue. This profit should, I think, be added to the capital of the institution, which would thus in course of time become a wealthy and self-supporting institution. The Mont-de-piété of Paris earned 26,000*l.* in 1875, after paying interest on a vast amount of borrowed capital, and no less than 3,400*l.* for rent. It is difficult to see why an English institution of the same kind should not be equally successful. It would of course be carried on under the existing Pawnbrokers' Act.

The advantage to the poor would be very great, even if the English Mont-de-piété charged as high a rate of interest as that of Paris; even then little more than one-third of the pawnbroker's charges for loans of 2*l.* and under would have to be paid. Next, a

considerable proportion of the property of those who are unable to redeem their pledges would no longer be confiscated, as is now the case. The managers would have to exercise the greatest care to avoid the reproach which is so often brought against the lower class of English pawnbrokers of assisting the operations of persons who have come by property dishonestly. This would not be so easy as in France, as no system of police registration by means of the *carte de séjour* exists with us. It may be observed, however, that every pledger in England is now required to give his name and address.

But is the foundation of a Mont-de-piété in England advisable? If the borrowing classes were to combine to establish a self-supporting institution of the kind, there could be no doubt as to the answer to this question. But the needy are the last persons in the world to whom combination is possible; and the idea, however admirable it may be in conception, must, it is to be feared, be dismissed as impracticable. The only way in which a start can be made is by private philanthropy. Nor in such a cause can there be any reason to hold back. It is true that there is a tendency to do a great deal too much for the poor in the present day. There is hardly a phase of his life in which a poor man may not, if he choose, avail himself of public or private charity to procure those necessities which he finds it irksome to provide for himself. The remedy for this state of things is, no doubt, to leave the poor a great deal more than they are now left to their own resources. Above all, a constant protest should be raised against the growing and pernicious habit of looking to the State to undertake functions which are properly beyond its scope, and are much better performed by those who are personally concerned in them. But in the case of the Mont-de-piété it is the really poor and the necessitous of all classes who are to be assisted. In such a case charity may properly intervene, at any rate to a limited extent. The assistance which is afforded is of the best kind, for it helps the needy to help themselves.

W. WALTER EDWARDS.

LIST OF AUTHORITIES.

Histoire des Monts-de-piété, par Dr. Cerretti. Padoue, 1752.

Situation administrative et financière des Monts-de-piété. Rapport présenté au nom du Conseil des Inspecteurs Généraux par M. O. Claveau. Paris, Imprimerie Nationale, 1876 (not published).

Budget des Recettes et Dépenses de l'Exercice, 1879. Paris, 1879.

Dictionnaire de l'Administration Française. Par M. Maurice Block. Paris, 1878.

Verlag van den Toestand der Gemeente Amsterdam gedurende het Jaar 1878. Amsterdam, 1879.

Reglement voor de Stads Bank van Leening te Amsterdam, 1807.

Pawnbrokers' Act, 35 and 36 Vict. ch. 93.

Aperçu Historique sur les Etablissements de Bienfaisance de la Ville de Bruxelles. Par J. F. Vander Rest. Bruxelles, 1860.

Loi sur la Réorganisation des Monts-de-Piété. Bruxelles, 1868.

INTELLIGENCE OF ANTS.

I.

I HAVE frequently been much struck by the absence of information, even among professed naturalists and professed psychologists, concerning the intelligence of ants. The literature on the subject being scattered and diffused, it is not many persons who have either the leisure or the inclination to search it out for themselves. Most of us, therefore, either rest in a general hazy belief that ants are wonderfully intelligent animals, without knowing exactly in what ways and degrees the intelligent action of these animals is displayed; or else, having read Sir John Lubbock's investigations, we come to the general conclusion that ants are not really such very intelligent animals after all, but, as was to have been expected from their small size and low position in the zoological scale, it only required some such methodical course of scientific investigation to show that previous ideas upon the subject were exaggerated, and that, when properly tested, ants are found to be rather stupid than otherwise. I have therefore thought it well to write a paper for this widely circulated Review, in order to diffuse some precise information concerning the facts of this interesting branch of natural history.

Not having any observations of my own to communicate, I have no special right to be heard on this subject; but as I have recently had occasion to read through the literature connected with it, I am able to render what I may call a filtered abstract of all the facts which have hitherto been observed by others. It is needful, however, to add that the filter has been necessarily a close one; if I had a large volume instead of a short paper as my containing vessel, the filtrate would still require to be a strongly condensed substance.

Powers of Special Sense.—Let us take first the sense of sight. Sir John Lubbock made a number of experiments on the influence of light coloured by passing through various tints of stained glass, with the following results. 1. The ants which he observed greatly disliked the presence of light within their nests, 'hurrying about in search of the darkest corners' when light was admitted. 2. Some colours were much more distasteful to them than others; for while under

a slip of red glass there were on one occasion congregated 890 ants, under a green slip there were 544, under a yellow 495, and under a violet only 5. 3. The rays thus act on these ants in a graduated series, which corresponds with the order of their influence on a photographic plate. Experiments were therefore made to test the effect of the rays on either side of the visible spectrum, but with negative results. In considering these experiments, however, it is important to remember that other observers (especially Moggridge in Europe and M'Cook in America) have described other species of ants (genus *Atta*) as fond of light. It would be interesting for any one who has an opportunity to try whether ants of this genus do not show towards the rays of the spectrum a scale of preference the reverse of that which Sir John Lubbock describes.

As regards hearing, Sir John found that sounds of various kinds do not produce any effect upon the insects, nor could he obtain any evidence of their emitting sounds, either audible or inaudible to human ears.

It has long been known that the sense of smell in ants is highly developed, and it appears to be the sense on which, like dogs, they mainly rely. Huber proved that they track one another's footsteps in finding their way to food, &c.; for he observed on drawing his finger across the trail so as to obliterate the scent, that the ants became confused and ran about in various directions, till they again came upon the trail on the other side of the interrupted space. By many ingeniously devised experiments Lubbock has amply confirmed Huber's statements, and concludes that in finding treasure 'they are guided in some cases by sight, while in others they track one another by scent,' depending however more upon scent than upon sight.

There can be little doubt that ants have a sense of taste, as they are so well able to distinguish sugary substances; and it is unquestionable that in their antennæ they possess highly elaborated organs of touch.

Sense of Direction.—It is certain that ants, in common with many other animals, possess some unaccountable sense of direction, whereby they are able to find their way independently of landmarks, &c. Sir John Lubbock tried a number of experiments in this connection, of which the following is perhaps the most conclusive. Between the nest and the food he placed a hat-box, in each of two opposite sides of which he bored a small hole, so that the ants, in passing from the nest to the food and back again, had to go in at one hole and out at the other. The box was fixed upon a pivot, where it could be easily rotated, and when the ants had well learnt their way to the food through the box, the latter was turned half round as soon as an ant had entered it; 'but in every case the ant turned too, thus retaining her direction.'

Sir John then placed in the stead of a hat-box a disc of white

paper. When an ant was on the disc making towards the food, he gently drew the paper to the other side of the food, so that the ant was conveyed by the moving surface in the same direction as that in which she was going, but *beyond* the point to which she intended to go. Under these circumstances the ant did not turn round, but went on to the further edge of the disc, 'when she seemed a good deal surprised at finding where she was.'

These results seem to indicate that the sense of direction is due to a process of registering all the changes of direction which may be made during the out-going journey, and that this power of registration has reference only to *lateral* movements; it has no reference to variations in the *velocity* of advance along the line in which the animal is progressing.

Powers of Communication.—Huber, Forel, Kirby and Spence, Dujardin, Burmeister, Franklin, and other observers have all expressed themselves as holding the opinion that ants are able to communicate information to one another by some system of language or signs. The facts, however, on which the opinion of these earlier observers rested, have not been stated with that degree of caution and detail which the acceptance of their opinion would require. But the more recent observations of Bates, Belt, Moggridge, Hague, Lincecum, M'Cook, and Lubbock, leave no doubt upon the subject. Two or three instances will be enough to select in order to prove the general fact. Hague, the geologist, kept upon his mantel-shelf a vase of flowers, and he noticed a file of small red ants on the wall above the shelf passing upwards and downwards between the latter and a small hole near the ceiling. The ants, whose object was to get at the flowers, were at first few; but they increased in number during several successive days, until an unbroken succession was formed all the way down the wall. To get rid of the ants, Hague then tried frequently brushing them off the wall upon the floor in great numbers; but the only result was that another train was formed to the flowers ascending from the floor. He therefore took more severe measures, and struck the end of his finger lightly upon the descending train near the flower-vase, so killing some and disabling others. 'The effect of this was immediate and unexpected. As soon as those ants which were approaching arrived near to where their fellows lay dead and suffering, they turned and fled with all possible haste, and in half an hour the wall above the mantel-shelf was cleared of ants.' The stream from below continued to ascend for an hour or two, the ants advancing 'hesitatingly just to the edge of the shelf, when, extending their antennæ and stretching their necks, they seemed to peep cautiously over the edge until beholding their suffering companions, when they too turned, expressing by their behaviour great excitement and terror.' Both columns of ants thus entirely disappeared. For several days there was a complete absence of ants: then a few began to

reappear; 'but instead of visiting the vase which had been the scene of the disaster, they avoided it altogether,' and made for another vessel containing flowers at the other end of the shelf. Hague here repeated the same experiment with exactly the same result. After this for several days no ants reappeared; and during the next three months it was only when fresh and particularly fragrant flowers were put into the vases that a few of the more daring ants ventured to straggle towards them. Hague concludes his letter to Mr. Darwin, in which these observations are contained, by saying:—

To turn back these stragglers and keep them out of sight for a number of days, sometimes for a fortnight, it is sufficient to kill one or two ants on the trail. . . . The moment the spot is reached an ant turns abruptly and makes for home, and in a little while there is not an ant visible on the wall.

Many other cases might be quoted to show that ants are able to communicate information to one another; but, to save space, I shall pass on to Sir John Lubbock's direct experiments upon this subject. Three similar and parallel tapes were stretched from an ant's nest to three similar glass vessels. In one of the latter Sir John placed several hundred larvæ, in another only two or three larvæ, and the third he left empty. The object of the empty glass was to see whether any ants might not run along the tapes without any special reference to the obtaining of larvæ; and this was found not to be the case. Sir John then put an ant to each of the other two glasses; they each took a larva, carried it to the nest, returned for another, and so on. Each time a larva was taken out of the glass containing only two or three, Sir John replaced it with another, so that the supply should not become exhausted. Lastly, every ant (except the two which had first been put to the larvæ), before reaching home with her burden, was caught and imprisoned till the observation terminated.

The result was that during $47\frac{1}{2}$ hours the ants which had access to the glass containing numerous larvæ brought 257 friends to their assistance; while during an interval of $5\frac{1}{2}$ hours longer those which visited the glass with only two or three larvæ brought only 82 friends. This result appears very conclusive as proving some power of definite communication, not only as to where food is to be found, but also as to the road which leads to the *largest store*. Further experiments, however, proved that these ants are not able to *describe the precise locality* where treasure is to be found. For, having exposed larvæ as before and placed an ant upon them, he watched every time that she came out of the nest with friends to assist her; but instead of allowing her to pilot the way, he took her up and carried her to the larvæ, allowing her to return with a larva upon her own feet. Under these circumstances the friends, although evidently coming out with the intention of finding some treasure, were never able to find it, but wandered about in various directions for a while, and then returned

to the nest. Thus, during two hours, she brought out altogether in her successive journeys no less than 120 ants, of which number only five in their unguided wanderings happened by chance to find the sought-for treasure.

Memory.—The general fact that whenever an ant finds her way to a store of food or larvæ she will return to it again and again in a more or less direct line from her nest, constitutes ample proof that the ant remembers her way to the store of food. It is of interest to note that the nature of this insect-memory appears to be identical with that of memory in general. Thus, a new fact becomes *impressed* upon ant-memory by repetition, and the impression is liable to become effaced by lapse of time. Sir John Lubbock found it necessary to *teach* the insects, by a repetition of several lessons, their way to treasure, if that way were long or unusual. With regard to the *duration* of memory in ants, it does not appear that any direct experiments have been made; but the following observation by Mr. Belt on its apparent duration in the leaf-cutting ant may be here stated. In June 1859 he found his garden invaded by these ants, and on following up their paths he found their nest about a hundred yards distant. He poured down their burrows a pint of diluted carbolic acid. The marauding parties were at once drawn off from the garden to meet the danger at home, while in the burrows themselves the greatest confusion prevailed. Next day he found the ants busily engaged in bringing up the ant-food from the old burrows and carrying it to newly formed ones a few yards distant. These, however, turned out to be intended only as temporary repositories; for in a few days both old and new burrows were entirely deserted, so that he supposed all the ants to have died. Subsequently, however, he found that they had migrated to a new site, about two hundred yards from the old one, and there established themselves in a new nest. Twelve months later the ants again invaded his garden, and again he treated them to a strong dose of carbolic acid. The ants, as on the previous occasion, were at once withdrawn from his garden, and two days afterwards he found 'all the survivors at work on one track that led directly to the old nest of the year before, where they were busily employed in making new excavations. . . It was a wholesale and entire migration.' Mr. Belt adds: 'I do not doubt that some of the leading minds in this formicarium recollected the nest of the year before, and directed the migration to it.' Of course it is possible that the leaders of the migration may have simply stumbled on the old burrows by accident, and, finding them already prepared as a nest, forthwith proceeded to transfer the food and larvæ; but as the old and the new burrows were separated from one another by so considerable a distance, this supposition does not seem probable, and the only other one open is that the ants remembered their former home for a period of twelve months. This sup-

position is rendered the more probable from a somewhat analogous case recorded by Karl Vogt in his *Lectures on Useful and Harmless Animals*. For several successive years ants from a certain nest used to go through certain inhabited streets to a chemist's shop six hundred mètres distant, in order to obtain access to a vessel filled with syrup. As it cannot be supposed that this vessel was found in successive working seasons by as many successive accidents, it can only be concluded that the ants remembered the syrup store from season to season.

Recognition.—I shall now pass on to consider a class of highly remarkable facts. It has been known since the observations of Huber that all the ants of the same community recognise one another as friends, while an ant introduced from another nest, even though it be an ant of the same species, is known at once to be a foreigner, and is usually maltreated or put to death. Huber found that when he removed an ant from a nest and kept it away from its companions for a period of four months, it was still recognised as a friend, and caressed by its previous fellow-citizens after the manner in which ants show friendship, viz., by stroking antennæ. Sir John Lubbock, after repeating and fully confirming these observations, extended them as follows.

He first tried prolonging the period of separation beyond four months, and found that it might be made more than three times as long without the ants forgetting their absent friend. Thinking that this fact could only be explained, either by all the ants knowing each other's personal appearance, or by their all having a distinctive smell peculiar to each nest, or by their all having a sign, like a pass-word, differing in different nests, Sir John tried separating some ants from a nest while still in the condition of larvæ, and, when they emerged as perfect insects, transferring them back to the nest from which they had been taken as larvæ. Of course in this case the ants in the nest could never have *seen* those which had been removed, for a larval ant is as unlike the mature insect as a caterpillar is unlike a butterfly; neither can it be supposed that the larvæ, thus kept away from the nest, should retain, when hatched out as perfect insects, any smell belonging to their parent nest; nor, lastly, is it reasonable to imagine that the animals, while still in the condition of larval grubs, can have been taught any gesture or sign used as a pass-word by the matured animals. Yet, although all these possible hypotheses seem to be thus fully excluded by the conditions of the experiment, the result showed unequivocally that the ants all recognised their transformed larvæ as native-born members of their community.

Next, therefore, Sir John Lubbock tried dividing a nest into two parts before the queen ants had become pregnant. Seven months after the division the queens laid their eggs, and five months later

these eggs had developed into perfect insects. He then transferred some of these young ants from the division of the nest in which they had been born to the division in which they had never been, even in the state of the egg. Yet these ants also were received as friends, in marked contrast to the reception accorded to ants from any other nest. It therefore seems to be blood-relationship that ants are able, in some way that is as yet wholly inexplicable, to recognise. It ought, however, to be remembered in this connection that in an experiment made by Forel on slave-making ants, it was proved that they almost instantaneously recognised their own slaves from other slaves of the same species—and this after their slaves had been kept away from the nest for a period of four months.

Under this heading I may also allude to the unquestionable evidence concerning enormous multitudes, or, as we might say, a whole nation of ants all recognising one another as belonging to the same nationality. No doubt the principle (whatever it may be) on which the power of recognition depends, is the same here as it is in the case of a single nest; but in the cases which I am about to quote the operation of this principle is indefinitely and incalculably extended. The cases to which I allude are those in which new ants' nests spring up as offshoots from the older ones, so that a nation of towns, as it were, gradually spreads to an immense circumference round an original centre. Forel describes such a nation of *F. exsecta* which comprised more than two hundred nests, and covered a space of nearly two hundred square mètres. Individual ants must here have been numbered by the million, and yet they all knew each other as friends—even those taken from furthestmost nests—while they would admit no foreigners within their territory.

A still more remarkable case is recorded by M'Cook of what he calls an 'ant town.' The one he has described occurs in the Alleghany mountains of North America, and consists of 1,600 or 1,700 nests, which rise in cones to a height of from two to five feet. The ground below is riddled in every direction with subterranean passages of communication. The inhabitants are all on the most friendly terms, so that if any one nest is injured it is repaired by help from the other nests. Here, also, foreign ants of the same species were not tolerated; so that we should have an analogous case if all the inhabitants of Europe should be directly known to one another as friends, while an American or an Australian, on setting foot upon European ground, should be immediately set upon as an enemy.

Emotions.—The pugnacity, valour, and rapacity of ants are too well and generally known to require the narration of special instances of their display. With regard to the tenderer emotions, however, there is among observers a difference of opinion. Sir John Lubbock found that the species of ants on which he experimented are apparently deficient in feelings both of affection and of sympathy. He

tried burying some specimens of *Lasius niger* beneath an ant-road; but none of the ants traversing the road made any attempt to release their imprisoned companions. He repeated the same experiment with the same result on various other species. Even when the friends in difficulty were actually in sight, it by no means followed that their companions would assist them. On imprisoning some friends in one bottle, the mouth of which was covered with muslin, and some strangers of the same species (*F. fusca*) in another bottle similarly protected, and placing both bottles in the nest, 'the ants which were at liberty took no notice of the bottle containing their imprisoned friends. The strangers in the other bottle, on the other hand, excited them considerably.' For days they crowded round this bottle, endeavouring to gnaw through the muslin by which its mouth was closed. This on the seventh day they succeeded in doing, when they killed the imprisoned strangers. 'The friends throughout were quite neglected,' so that this experiment, as Sir John observes, seems to show that 'in these curious insects hatred is a stronger passion than affection.' This experiment always gave the same result in the case of this species; but when tried with *Formica rufescens*, the ants took no notice of either bottle, and showed no signs either of affection or hatred; so that, as Sir John again observes, 'one is almost tempted to surmise that the spirit of these ants is broken by slavery'—i.e. by the habit of keeping slaves.

But there is no lack of evidence to show, *per contra*, that the tenderer emotions have a place in ant-psychology. Even the hard-hearted species which Sir John Lubbock observed grew sympathetic towards sick or injured friends. Thus he observed that a specimen of *F. fusca*, which was congenitally destitute of antennæ, and which had been attacked by an ant of another species, excited the sympathy of a friend on being placed near her own nest. This friend 'examined the poor sufferer carefully, then picked her up tenderly, and carried her away into the nest. It would have been difficult for any one who witnessed this scene to have denied to this ant the possession of humane feelings.' Again, Moggridge has seen one ant carry another sick and apparently dead ant 'down the twig which formed their path to the surface of the water, and, after dipping it in for a minute, carry it laboriously up again, and lay it in the sun to dry and recover.'

But some species of ants seem habitually to show affection and sympathy even towards healthy companions in distress. Thus Belt writes of the *Eciton humata*, that 'one day watching a small column of these ants, I placed a little stone on one of them to secure it. The next that approached, as soon as it discovered its situation, ran backwards in an agitated manner, and soon communicated the intelligence to the others. They rushed to the rescue,' and by their concerted action effected the release of their companion. Similarly ants of this

species which Belt buried were always dug out by their friends. To quote one such instance, the ant which first found the buried one

tried to pull her out, but could not. It immediately set off at a great rate, and I thought it had deserted her comrade, but it had only gone for assistance; for in a short time about a dozen ants came hurrying up, evidently fully informed of the circumstances of the case, for they made directly for their imprisoned comrade and set him free. I do not see how this could be instinctive. It was sympathetic help, such as men only among the higher mammalia show. The excitement and ardour with which they carried on their unflagging exertions for the rescue of their comrade could not have been greater if they had been human beings.

Forel and M'Cook have also observed displays of sympathy and affection by other species.

Nursing.—This may appropriately be considered in connection with the emotions, as it seems to imply something akin to maternal affection. The eggs will not develop into larvæ unless nursed, and the nursing is effected by licking the surface of the eggs, which under the influence of this process increase in size, or grow. In about a fortnight—during which time the workers carry the eggs from higher to lower levels of the nest, and *vice versa*, according to the circumstances of heat, moisture, &c.—the larvæ are hatched out, and require no less careful nursing than the eggs. The workers feed them by placing mouths together—the larvæ stretching out their heads to receive the nourishment after the manner of young birds. When fully grown the larvæ spin cocoons, and are then pupæ, or the ‘ants’ eggs’ of the pheasant-rearers. These require no food, but still need incessant attention with reference to warmth, moisture, and cleanliness. When the time arrives for their emergence as perfect insects, the workers assist them to get out of their larval cases by biting through the walls of the latter. When it emerges the newly-born ant is enclosed in a thin membrane like a shirt, which has to be pulled off. ‘When we see,’ says Büchner, ‘how neatly and gently this is done, and how the young creature is then washed, brushed, and fed, we are involuntarily reminded of the nursing of human babies.’ The young ants are then educated. They are led about the nest and taught their various domestic duties. Later on they learn to distinguish between friends and foes; and when an ant’s nest is attacked by foreign ants the young ones never join in the fight, but confine themselves to removing the pupæ. That the knowledge of hereditary enemies is not wholly instinctive is proved by the experiment of Forel, who put young uneducated ants of three different species into a glass case with pupæ of six other species—all the nine species being naturally hostile to one another. Yet the young ants did not quarrel, but worked together to tend the pupæ. When the latter hatched out, an artificial colony was formed of a number of naturally hostile species, all living together like the ‘happy families’ of the showmen.

Keeping Aphides.—It is well and generally known that various species of ants keep aphides, as men keep milch-cows, to supply a nutritious secretion. Huber first observed this fact, and noticed that the ants collected the eggs of the aphides, and treated them with as much apparent care as they treated their own. When these eggs hatch out, the aphides are usually kept and fed by the ants. Sometimes the stems and branches on which they live are encased by the ants in clay walls, in which doors are left large enough to admit the ants, but too small to allow the aphides to escape. The latter are therefore imprisoned in regular stables. The sweet secretion is yielded to the ants by a process of ‘milking,’ which consists in the ants stroking the aphides with their antennæ.

Sir John Lubbock has made an interesting addition to our knowledge respecting the habit in question, as practised by a certain species of ant (*Lasius flavus*), which departs in a somewhat remarkable manner from the habit as practised by other species. He says: ‘When my eggs hatched I naturally thought that the aphides belonged to one of the species usually found on the roots of plants in the nests of *Lasius flavus*. To my surprise, however, the young creatures made the best of their way out of the nest, and, indeed, were sometimes brought out of the nest by the ants themselves.’ Subsequent observation showed that these aphides, born from eggs hatched in the ants’ nest, left the nest, or were taken from it, as soon as they were hatched, in order to live upon a kind of daisy which grew around the nest. Sir John then made out the whole case to be as follows:—

Here are aphides, not living in the ants’ nests, but outside, on the leaf-stalks of plants. The eggs are laid early in October on the food-plant of the insect. They are of no direct use to the ants, yet they are not left where they are laid, where they would be exposed to the severity of the weather and to innumerable dangers, but are brought into their nests by the ants, and tended by them with the utmost care through the long winter months until the following March, when the young ones are brought out and again placed on the young shoots of the daisy. This seems to me a most remarkable case of prudence. Our ants may not perhaps lay up food for the winter, but they do more, for they keep during six months the eggs which will enable them to procure food during the following winter.

As a supplement to this interesting observation, I may here append the following, which is due to Herr Nottebohm, who communicated it to Professor Büchner. This gentleman had a weeping ash which was covered by millions of aphides. To save the tree he one day in March cleaned and washed every branch and spray before the buds had burst, so removing all the aphides. There was no sign of the latter till the beginning of June, when he was surprised one fine sunny morning to see a number of ants running quickly up and down the trunk of the tree, each carrying up a single aphid to deposit it on the leaves, when it hurried back to fetch

another. 'After some weeks the evil was as great as ever. . . . I had destroyed one colony, but the ants replanted it by bringing new colonists from distant trees and setting them on the young leaves.'

Aphides are not the only insects which are utilised by ants as cows. Gall insects and cocci are kept in just the same way; but M'Cook observed that where aphides and cocci are kept by the same ants, they are kept in separate chambers, or stalls. Caterpillars of the genus *Lycæna* have also been observed to be kept by ants for the sake of a sweet secretion which they supply.

Slavery.—The habit or instinct of keeping slaves obtains at least among three species of ant. It was first observed by P. Huber in *Formica rufescens*, which enslaves the species *F. fusca*, the members of which are appropriately coloured black. The slave-making ants attack a nest of *F. fusca* in a body; there is a great fight with much slaughter, and, if victorious, the slave-makers carry off the pupæ of the vanquished nest in order to hatch them out as slaves. When these pupæ hatch out, the young slaves begin their life of work, and seem to regard their masters' home as their own; for they never attempt to escape, and they fight in defence of the nest should it be attacked. The work that devolves upon the slaves differs according to the species which has enslaved them. In the nests of *F. sanguinea* the comparatively few captives are kept exclusively as household slaves, all the outdoor work of foraging, slave-capturing, &c., being performed by the masters; and when for any reason a nest has to migrate, the masters carry their slaves in their jaws. On the other hand, *F. rufescens* assigns a much larger share of work to the slaves, which they capture in much larger numbers to take it. In this species the masters do no work whatsoever, unless the capturing of slaves be regarded as such. Therefore the whole community is entirely dependent upon its slaves; the masters are not able to make their own nests, to feed their own larvæ, or even to feed themselves; they die of starvation in the midst of favourite food if a slave should not be present to hand it in proper form. In order to confirm this observation (originally due to Huber) Lespès placed a piece of moistened sugar near a nest of these slave-makers. It was soon found by one of the slaves, which gorged itself and returned. Other slaves then came out and did likewise. Some of the masters next came out, and by pulling the legs of the feeding slaves reminded them that they were neglecting their duty. The slaves then immediately began to serve their masters to the sugar. Had they not done so, there is no doubt they would have been punished, for the masters bite the slaves when displeased with them. Forel and Darwin have also confirmed these observations of Huber. Indeed, the structure of the mouth in *F. rufescens* is such as to render self-feeding difficult, if not physically impossible. Its long and narrow jaws, admirably adapted to pierce the head of an enemy, do not

admit of being used for feeding unless liquid food is poured into them from the mouth of a slave.

Ants do not appear to be the only animals of which ants make slaves ; for there is at least one case in which these wonderful insects enslave insects of another species, which may therefore be said to stand to them in the relation of beasts of burden. The case to which I allude stands upon the authority of Audubon, who says that he has seen certain leaf-bugs used as slaves by ants in the forests of Brazil.

When these ants want to bring home the leaves which they have bitten off the trees, they do it by means of a column of these bugs, which go in pairs, kept in order on either side by accompanying ants. They compel stragglers to re-enter the ranks, and laggards to keep up by biting them. After the work is done the bugs are shut up within the colony and scantily fed.

Wars.—On the wars of ants a great deal might be said, as the facts of interest in this connection are very numerous ; but for the sake of brevity I shall confine myself to giving only a somewhat meagre account. One great cause of war is the plundering of ants' nests by the slave-making species. Observers all agree that in the case of the so-called Amazon slave-making ant, this plundering is effected by a united march of the whole army composing a nest, directed against some particular nest of the species which they enslave. According to Lespès and Forel, single scouts or small companies are first sent out from the nest to explore in various directions for a suitable nest to attack. These scouts afterwards serve as guides to the marauding excursion. When the scouts have been successful in discerning a suitable nest to plunder, and have completed their strategical investigations of the locality to their satisfaction—the latter process being often a laborious one, as it has special reference to the entrances of the nest, which are purposely made difficult to find by their architects—they return to their own fortress. Forel has seen them then walk about on the surface of this underground fortress for a long time, as if in consultation, after which some of them entered and again came out leading the host of warriors ; these streamed from all the gateways, and ran about tapping each other with their heads and antennæ. They then formed into a column, composed of between 1,000 and 2,000 individuals, and set out in orderly march to pillage the nest which had been examined by the scouts. According to Lespès, the column is about five mètres long and fifty centimètres wide, marches at the rate of a mètre per minute, and, on account of the distance which may have to be traversed, the march sometimes lasts for more than an hour. When they arrive at their destination a fierce battle begins, which, after raging for a time with much slaughter on both sides, generally, though not invariably, ends in the robbers gaining an entry. A barricade conflict then takes place below ground, and, if the attack proves successful, the

slave-making ants again stream out of the plundered nest, each ant carrying a stolen pupa. The Amazons cannot climb, and this fact being known to the other ants, when they find that victory is on the side of the enemy, they devote themselves to saving what treasure they can by carrying their pupæ up the grasses and bushes surrounding the nest. When the marauders have obtained all the booty that they can, they set off on their homeward march, each carrying a pupa. They do not always follow the shortest road, but return exactly on the track by which they came, no doubt being guided entirely by the scent left on the ground from their previous march. When they arrive home they commit the pupæ to the care of the slaves. Forel found that a particular colony of slave-makers watched by him sent out forty-four marauding expeditions in thirty days, of which number twenty-eight were completely successful, nine partially so, and the remainder failures. The average booty obtained by a successful expedition was 1,000 pupæ, so that during a single summer the total number of pupæ captured by this colony might be put down at 40,000.

Forel further tried the following experiment. He kept nests of two species of slave-making ants in two separate sacks, and when he saw that an expedition of a third species (Amazons) had found a slave-nest to plunder, and were fairly on their march towards it, he turned out one of his sacks upon the nest. A fight at once began between the slave-ants and sanguine ants which he had turned loose upon them. Then the vanguard of the Amazons came up; but when they saw that the sanguines were already on the field they drew back and awaited the approach of the main army. In close order this whole army then precipitated itself upon the already struggling host of sanguine ants. The latter, however, repulsed the attack, and the Amazons retired to reform. This done they made a second assault, which appearing as if it would end successfully, Forel, to complicate matters, poured upon the field his second sack containing the third species of slave-makers. All three species then fought together, till at last victory declared itself on the side of the Amazons. After overcoming their enemies they paused for a breathing space before beginning the work of plunder. They then ravished the nest of the slave-ants, which, however, fought desperately, so that it seemed as though they courted death. They even followed the Amazons right up to their own nest, harassing them all the way. On arriving at the nest of the Amazons the slaves of the latter came out and assisted their masters to fight. These slaves were of two species—one being the same as that which was being plundered, so that these slaves were fighting for their masters against their own kind. Altogether, therefore, in that day's warfare there were six different species of ants engaged, three in alliance, and the rest in mutual antagonism.

The military tactics employed by the sanguine ants above mentioned are different from those employed by the Amazons. They do

not seek to carry the fortress of the slave-ants by storm, but lay a regular siege, forming a complete circle round the nest, and facing it with jaws held fiercely open and antennæ thrown back. Being individually large and strong, they are able thus to confine the whole nest of slave-ants. A special guard is set upon the entrances of the nest, and this allows all slave-ants not carrying pupæ to pass, while it stops all the slave-ants which carry pupæ. The siege lasts till most of the slave-ants have thus been allowed to pass out, while all the pupæ are left behind. The forces then close in upon the entrances and completely rattle the nest of its pupæ—a few companies, however, being told off to pursue any slave-ants which may possibly have succeeded here and there in escaping with a pupa.

Wars are not confined to species of ants having slave-making habits. The agricultural ants likewise at times have fierce contests with one another. The importance of seeds to these insects, and the consequent value which they set upon them, induce the animals, when supplies are scarce, to plunder one another's nests, prolonged warfare being the result. Thus Moggridge says: 'By far the most savage and prolonged contests which I have witnessed were those in which the combatants belonged to two different colonies of the same species. . . . The most singular contests are those which are waged for seeds by *A. barbara*, when one colony plunders the stores of an adjacent nest belonging to the same species; the weaker nest making prolonged, though, for the most part, inefficient attempts to recover their property.' In one case the predatory war lasted for forty-six days, during which time it became evident that the attacking nest was the stronger, for

streams of ants laden with seeds arrived safely at the upper nest, while close observation showed that very few seeds were successfully carried on the reverse journey into the lower or plundered nest. Thus, when I fixed my attention on one of these robbed ants surreptitiously making its exit with the seed from the thieves' nest, and having overcome the oppositions and dangers met with on its way, reaching, after a journey which took six minutes to accomplish, the entrance to its own home, I saw that it was violently deprived of its burden by a guard of ants stationed there apparently for the purpose, one of whom instantly started off and carried the seed all the way back again to the upper nest. . . . After the 4th of March I never saw any acts of hostility between these nests, though the robbed nest was not abandoned. In another case of the same kind, however, where the struggle lasted thirty-two days, the robbed nest was at length completely abandoned.

Lastly, M'Cook records the history of an interesting engagement which he witnessed between two nests of *Tetramorium cespitum* in the streets of Philadelphia, and which lasted for nearly three weeks. Although all the combatants belonged to the same species, friends were always distinguished from foes, however great the confusion of the fight. This fact is always observable in the case of battles between nests of the same species, and M'Cook thinks that the distinction appears to be effected in some way by contact of antennæ.

Keeping Pets.—Many species of ants display the curious habit of harbouring in their nests sundry kinds of other insects, which, so far as observation extends, are of no benefit to the ants, and which have therefore been regarded by observers as mere domestic pets. These pets are, for the most part, species which occur nowhere else except in ants' nests, and each species of pet is peculiar to certain species of ant. Beetles and crickets seem to be the more favourite kinds of insects, and these live on the best terms with their hosts, playing round the nests in fine weather, and retiring into them in stormy weather, while allowing the ants to carry them from place to place during migrations. It is evident, therefore, that ants not only tolerate these insects, but foster them; and as it seems absurd to credit the ants with any mere fancy or caprice, such as that of keeping pets, it is perhaps safest to suppose that these insects, like the aphides, are of some use to their masters, although we are not yet in a position to surmise what this use can be.

Sleep and Cleanliness.—It is probable that all ants enjoy periods of true slumber alternating with those of activity; but actual observations on this subject have only been made in the case of two or three species. McCook says that the harvesting ants of Texas sleep so soundly that they may be pretty severely stroked with a feather without being aroused; but they are immediately awakened by a sharp tap. On awakening they often stretch their limbs in a manner precisely resembling that of warm-blooded animals, and even yawn---the latter action being 'very like that of the human animal; the mandibles are thrown open with the peculiar muscular strain which is familiar to all readers; the tongue is also sometimes thrust out.' The ordinary duration of sleep in this species is about three hours.

Invariably on awakening, and often at other times, the ants perform, like many other insects, elaborate processes of washing and brushing. But, unlike other insects, ants assist one another in the performance of their toilet. The author just quoted describes the whole process in the genus *Atta*. The cleanser begins with washing the face of her companion, and then passes on to the thorax, legs, and abdomen.

The attitude of the cleansed all this while is one of intense satisfaction, quite resembling that of a family dog when one is scratching the back of his neck. The insect stretches out her limbs, and, as her friend takes them successively into hand, yields them limp and supple to her manipulation; she rolls gently over on her side, even quite over on her back, and with all her limbs relaxed presents a perfect picture of muscular surrender and ease. The pleasure which the creatures take in being thus 'combed' and 'sponged' is really enjoyable to the observer. I have seen an ant kneel down before another and thrust forward the head drooping quite under the face, and lie there motionless, thus expressing, as plainly as sign-language could, her desire to be cleansed. I at once understood the gesture, and so did the supplicated ant, for she at once went to work.

Bates also has described similar facts with regard to ants of another genus—the *Ecitons*.

Play and Leisure.—The life of ants is not all work, or, at least, is not so in all species. Huber describes regular gymnastic sports as practised by the species *pratensis*. They raise themselves on their hind legs to wrestle and throw pretended antagonists with their fore legs, run after each other, and seem to play at hide and seek. When one is victorious in a display of strength, it often seizes all the others in the ring, and tumbles them about like nine-pins. Forel has amply confirmed these observations of Huber, and says that the chasing, struggling, and rolling together upon the ground, pulling each other in and out of the entrances, &c., irresistibly reminded him of romping boys at play. ‘I understand,’ he says, ‘that the matter must seem wonderful to those who have not witnessed it, particularly when we remember that sexual attraction can here play no part.’

McCook and Bates also give similar accounts of the habits of play and leisure among species of the Western hemisphere.

Funerals.—The habit of carrying their dead out and away from their nests is very general, if not universal, among ants; and being no doubt due to sanitary requirements, has probably been developed as a beneficial instinct by natural selection. McCook says of the agricultural ants:—

¶ All species whose manners I have closely observed are quite alike in their mode of caring for their own dead, and for the dry carcasses of aliens. The former they appear to treat with some degree of reverence, at least to the extent of giving them a sort of sepulture without feeding upon them. The latter, after having exhausted the juices of the body, they usually deposit together in some spot removed from the nest.

Experiments made on ants kept in confinement showed that the desire to remove dead companions was one of the strongest that they exhibited.

So great was the desire to get rid of the dead outside the nest, that the bearers would climb up the smooth surface of the glass to the very top of the jar, laboriously carrying with them a dead ant. This was severe work, which was rarely undertaken except under the influence of this funereal enthusiasm. Falls were frequent, but patiently the little ‘undertaker’ would follow the impulse of her instinct and try and try again. Finally the fact of a necessity seemed to dawn upon the ants (the jar being closed at the top so that they could not get out), and a portion of the surface opposite from the entrance to the galleries, and close up against the glass, was used as a burial-ground and sort of kitchen-midden, where all the refuse of the nest was deposited.

This author also records in his recently published work an interesting piece of information to which he was led by Mrs. Treat.

A visit was paid to a large colony of these slave-makers (*F. sanguinea*), which is established on the grounds adjoining her residence at Vineland, New Jersey. I noticed that a number of carcasses of one of the slave species, *Formica fusca*, were deposited together quite near the gates of the nest. They were probably chiefly

the dry bodies of ants brought in from recent raids. It was noticed that the dead ants were all of one species, and therefore Mrs. Treat informed me that the red slave-makers never deposited their dead with those of their black servitors, but always laid them by themselves, not in groups, but separately, and were careful to take them a considerable distance from the nest. One can hardly resist pointing here another likeness between the customs of these social hymenoptera and those of human beings, certain of whom carry their distinctions of race, condition or religious caste even to the gates of the cemetery, in which the poor body moulders into its mother dust!

GEORGE J. ROMANES.

CARLYLE'S 'REMINISCENCES.'¹

THE publication of Carlyle's *Reminiscences*, with all, or, if not all, far too much, of what is said in them of his friends and acquaintances, has thrown a sad element of bitterness into the outburst of admiration and sorrow which followed upon his death. It could not be otherwise, and the Upas is not the tree that should be planted on the grave of a great man.

I knew him for, I think, nearly fifty years, and what I know best is that he was not easily to be understood. One thing about him it is almost needless to say—that he was like nobody else. The world must judge men by its experience; and when the guidance of experience is wanting, the world is in a way to misjudge. It has had no experience whatever of men like Carlyle; and the circumstances under which most of these *Reminiscences* were written may have made *them* even more liable to be misunderstood than, under any ordinary conditions, Carlyle himself would be.

Those to which any exception can be taken were written in deep distress, in the autumn and winter following the death of his wife. And 'so singular was his condition at this time,' Mr. Froude tells us, 'that he was afterwards unconscious of what he had done, and when ten years later I found the Irving MS. and asked him about it, he did not know to what I was alluding.'

In such a state of disturbance if a man's mind can be saved, it must be by occupation; and if any occupation is possible, it will be that which has been habitual. The habit of Carlyle's mind was to look into the past, to describe what he saw there, to give it shape and colour in language, and to write about it; and this was the resource to which he betook himself.

Mr. Froude avows frankly enough his undivided responsibility for the publication of what had been so written.² He avows his responsi-

¹ *Reminiscences*. By Thomas Carlyle. Edited by James Anthony Froude. 2 vols. (London: Longmans and Co., 1881.)

² Mr. Carlyle's will is now published, and adverts to the MS. in these terms:— 'The manuscript is by no means ready for publication; nay, the questions how, when (after what delay, seven, ten years), it, or any portion of it, shall be published, are still dark to me; but on all such points James Anthony Froude's practical summing up and decision is to be taken as mine.'

bility; but, to judge by what he has done, with no adequate sense of what it amounts to. 'The reader has here before him,' he says, 'Mr. Carlyle's own handiwork, but without his last touches, not edited by himself, not corrected by himself, perhaps most of it not intended for publication.' Just so; and the reader as he reads, if he feels as I do, will feel himself to be overhearing a soliloquy; and not the less a soliloquy because the diction is now and then strained and overwrought. It is for the most part less so than was usual with him; and men who have made the moulding of language the business of their lives may naturally fall into the practice in soliloquy from the force of habit.

If then many of the things in this book which we are grieved to find in it had merely passed through Carlyle's mind, unspoken and unwritten, should we have thought him so very much to blame? Do we not all of us, when not determined to shut our eyes, see failings and disfigurements in our friends and associates, and find no fault with ourselves for seeing them, provided we make no mention of them?

But it will be said that in some instances Carlyle has imagined faults and disfigurements which did not exist, and has failed to see merits and attractions which did. That also will happen to most of us; allowing ourselves in our silent meditations to come to conclusions, both positive and negative, from inadequate premisses and with imperfect discernment.

No doubt it would be much better if we did no such thing; better if our secret thoughts went quite another way; especially when measuring the merits of those who have been kind to us; and it is not surprising that when the misappreciation is made known it should be angrily denounced by the friends of those who have suffered wrong. *They* may 'be angry and sin not.' And there are instances in which even others who stand apart must feel strongly in sympathy with those who are aggrieved. On the other hand, not a few of these hasty or unfounded judgments, as they impute no *moral* infirmity and inflict nothing that can be called a personal injury, need not be matter of personal reproach to their author; and those to whom they come amiss, whether on private grounds or on the ground of public interests involved in literary reputations, will be better employed, if they happen to be competent witnesses, in the rectification of what they know to be wrong than in censure and complaint.

As an example which fails to my own lot, I will advert to what is said about Wordsworth. Carlyle's insensibility to his powers as a poet it is needless to deal with. His work is before the world, and the world knows what it is worth. But everything that can throw light upon him is interesting, and when I read what Carlyle says of his conversation, I feel it due to his memory to say something of its effect on myself. And the more as it was through me that Carlyle

became acquainted with Wordsworth, and most of the conversations in question took place in a house which he speaks of as mine.³ He accords great praise to Wordsworth's faculty of delineating the men of his time. 'Never, or never but once, had I seen a stronger intellect, a more luminous and veracious power of insight, directed upon such a survey of fellow-men and their contemporary journey through the world.'⁴ So far well; and it is evident that there was no desire to depreciate. But on another occasion when the talk was about 'literature, literary laws, &c., Wordsworth is represented as 'joyfully reverent of the "wells of English undefiled," though stone dumb as to the deeper rules and wells of Eternal Truth and Harmony, which you were to try and set forth by said undefiled wells of English or what other speech you had! To me a little disappointing, but not much, though it would have given me pleasure had the robust veteran man emerged a little out of vocables into things, now and then, as he never once chanced to do.'⁵ There is a good deal more of the like tone and tenor in giving an account of divers other conversations.

Now, all this might be a fair inference enough from what Carlyle happened to hear from Wordsworth in conversation; and Carlyle, speaking to himself, may not have thought it necessary to say to himself that an inference from a few examples is no more than an inference *huc usque*. But the inference was certainly an erroneous one. Those who have had a large experience of Wordsworth in conversation know that it was mere matter of accident whether he trod upon the earth or mounted into the skies. He never dreamt of display, and whatever topic, celestial or terrene, happened to come across him, he was equally ready to deal with. Whilst, therefore, I maintain that there is no ground for imputing to Carlyle any deliberately unjust disparagement, I think that I may claim more credit, as founded upon more knowledge, for my own estimate of Wordsworth's powers in conversation; and what that estimate was at the time of those conversations in my friend's house in London, and what it is still, is expressed in a letter written there and then, though no doubt prompted by other examples than those at which Carlyle happened to be present:—

This old philosopher is one of the most extraordinary human phenomena that one could have in the house. He has the simplicity and helplessness of a child in regard to the little transactions of life; and whilst he is being directed and dealt with in regard to them, he keeps tumbling out the highest and deepest thoughts that the mind of man can reach, in a stream of discourse which is so oddly broken by the little hitches and interruptions of common life, that we admire and laugh at him by turns. Everything that comes into his mind comes out; weakness and strength; affections or vanities; so that if ever an opportunity was offered of seeing

³ It was the house of an elderly lady, a friend and connection of mine, with whom I was in the habit of staying when she was in London.

⁴ Vol. ii. p. 336.

⁵ Vol. ii. pp. 332-3.

a human being through and through, we have it in the person of this 'old man eloquent.'⁶

Of Coleridge's gifts of speech Carlyle is still less appreciative than of Wordsworth's:—

I had him to myself once or twice in various parts of the garden walk and tried hard to get something about Kant from him—about reason *versus* understanding and the like—but in vain. Nothing came that was of use to me that day or, in fact, any day. The sight and sound of a sage who was so venerated by those about me, and whom I too would willingly have venerated but could not—this was all.⁷

So in the *Reminiscences*. But not altogether so in the *Life of Sterling*.⁸ There we find Coleridge to be 'A sublime man; who alone in those dark days had saved his crown of spiritual manhood; escaping from the black materialisms and revolutionary deluges with "God, Freedom, Immortality" still his: A king of men.' And though this is followed by a long train of offsets, with denials of any meaning being to be gathered from the mysteries of his doctrinal declamations, yet, all this notwithstanding, there were 'glorious Islets' to be seen 'rising out of the haze'—'balmy, sunny Islets, Islets of the blest and the intelligible'—and 'eloquent artistically expressive words you always had; piercing radiances of a most subtle insight came at intervals; tones of noble, pious sympathy, recognisable as pious though strangely coloured, were never wanting long.' My experiences of Coleridge's conversation were in accord with what is thus expressed in the *Life of Sterling*, and by no means with the passage from the *Reminiscences*. What opportunities Carlyle had of listening to Coleridge, I know only from the *Reminiscences*. They may not have been very ample. And there is this to be borne in mind—that Carlyle himself had a great gift of speech, and when these gifts confront each other, however amicably, the gifts of auscultation, whether on one side or the other, are not generally found to be great in proportion. My own opportunities were not so abundant in the case of Coleridge as in that of Wordsworth, but they

⁶ Mr. Carlyle's description, or rather his wife's, adopted by him, of Mrs. Wordsworth, whom they once saw, or thought they saw, at a dinner party, is so wholly opposite, not only to what she was, but to what she was manifestly seen to be by those who did not know her as well as by those who did, that I cannot but think there was simply a mistake of one person for another. She was not 'little' but rather tall; and as to the other misrepresentations, what I have to say is, that her manner and deportment were in entire harmony with her character—unexceptionable in their quiet grace and easy simplicity; and that, like another dweller in the woods and mountains known to her husband, Nature had said of her when she was born,—

'This child I to myself will take,
She shall be mine and I will make
A Lady of mine own.'

This was absolutely true of Mrs. Wordsworth.

⁷ Vol. i. pp. 230–1.

⁸ *Life of Sterling*, chapter viii.

were probably equal to those of Carlyle. It is only in his latter years and in his decline that he could be seen by either of us, and what I recollect is, that I could not sleep at nights after hearing him talk. Between April 1823 and February 1824, I kept an occasional diary, in which the last entries are these :—

February 24, 1824.—Coleridge said he did not perceive his daughter's beauty. The perception of female beauty was the only thing in which his mind was conscious of age. It had decayed with him. I expressed my admiration of a distinct contour of features. Coleridge concurred, but said, 'the contour of the face should be an act of the face, and not something suffered by the face.'

February 26, 1824.—Certainly the most extraordinary evening I ever passed; Coleridge with his luminous face and white head, Irving's wild dark locks and wilder eyes, and the keen analytical visage of Basil Montagu. The poring and mining of Wordsworth out of the depths of his intellect is not half so wonderful as Coleridge was to-night, and the buoyancy of Southey is only more delightful.

August 5, 1824.—At Coleridge's again, and with the same company. He was this evening less vehement than I have heard him, but no less extraordinary and admirable. His language was less interrupted by logical catches, and more fanciful and romantic. For instance, in speaking of men led by age to fix their thoughts on that which was permanent within them, 'when their eyes grew dimmer and their ears less apprehensive, and the objects which surrounded them more shadowy and cold, &c., &c. . . . He did not say that this would be the case with the man who had spent all his life in trading, with only the principle of money-getting, or in the pursuit of a not less foolish ambition, —the man who chained himself to the wheel of events and was rolled rapidly on without being able to stop himself for an instant to think of anything further than the objects which surrounded him; who was in fact only a reflection of the surrounding objects— it was not to be said, when the objects grew dim and disappeared, but that he would go out— it was not to be said but that the mirror would be a blank, when the objects which were its population were removed,' &c.

My diary goes no further, but I can add a supplement from a letter (February 18, 1829):—

I have been two or three times to see the old gentleman this winter, and his talk has been sometimes exceedingly curious and sometimes very magnificent. I never knew such a scope of mind exhibited in any man,—such largeness of views, together with such subtlety of insight, and a vivid imagination flashing through all.

If Carlyle is less than just to Wordsworth and Coleridge, on the other hand his description of Southey is genial as well as faithful and true. It was through me that they became known to each other—the time soon after the publication of Carlyle's work on the French Revolution. Southey, in speaking of it to me, called it 'a Pindaric History,' adding that he should probably read it six times over. This augured well for a meeting between them, and, judging from the *Reminiscences*, the meeting was an unalloyed pleasure to Carlyle, nor is there, in the case of Southey, any backing out from his first impressions. Southey was of all the men of letters of his generation that I knew the most personally attractive, and he found favour with Carlyle.

Admiration is designated by Wordsworth as one of the three vital elements in the mind of man.⁹ For the historic heroes of whom he read and wrote Carlyle could feel an abounding admiration; for his fellow-creatures whom he saw in the flesh he could find his way to it often enough, but not so surely or in so large a measure except through love. When that way was opened the approach was by no means uphill work, and least of all when it lay through the gates of death. Mrs. Carlyle made him an admirable wife, and it is with an impassioned admiration that he writes of her. Nor is there anything in his *Reminiscences* which will be read with more interest and sympathy than his account of his father, to whom also he had been ardently attached. In his portraiture generally he aims at force and intensity of first effects, accompanied, in some measure qualified, and even more or less counteracted, by subtle and discriminating reservations, or by casting of shadows across the lights. But love and death could clear away all subtleties and distinctions in perception, and even much of what was far-fetched or peculiar to himself in diction; and in the descriptions of his wife and his father we have for the most part a simplicity of language, passionate in the one case, affectionate in the other, which, whether or not it be chargeable with exaggeration, will have more of a charm for most people than the best of his elaborate utterances.

And when the failure to see what was admirable in some of his contemporaries is complained of, the darkness which fell upon him at his wife's death is not the only thing to be borne in mind. From his twenty-second year till he was in middle age his life had been that of a forlorn man of genius, gloomy and irritable by temperament, disordered in health, conscious in a measure, but not confidently or hopefully conscious, of the powers he possessed, and above all despairing of their recognition by others. Nor was the despair so altogether unreasonable as results may lead us now to suppose. At a time when he was slowly emerging from obscurity, and sadly struggling for the means of subsistence, I was in communication on the subject of literary pensions with the one of our statesmen now gone to their rest who was the most distinguished for his love of literature, whilst his feelings of benevolence certainly exceeded what most of our public men have time for. I ventured to propose that a pension should be offered to Carlyle, and the answer was that a man who wrote such a style as that *ought* to starve. Carlyle did not know of the proposal at the time, nor did it ever come to his knowledge, nor would it perhaps have met with his approval. But the reception given to it is significant of what was thought of him by most men of high cultivation in the orthodox and classical school of literature. No vagrant or gipsy could have had to break his way through more boundaries:

The world was not his friend nor the world's law;

‘We live by admiration, hope, and love.’

and the struggle was naturally fierce as well as brave. No one can wonder that a spirit of oppugnancy should have been generated, or that it should have come into the keenest encounter with the favourites of that so unfriendly world.

The feelings with which he fought his way were softened when the victory was won; but then came his isolation after the death of his wife, which took him back to his earlier life; he fought his old battles over again, and whilst loving with an agony of love her whom he had lost, the morbid and morose contempt with which he had looked down upon the world that knew him not, possessed him once more. Even at other seasons, and indeed at all seasons, except that of his first youth, there was an habitual mournfulness which pervaded his views of mankind and lowered his estimate of their gifts and felicities. I find myself writing in 1844 (in a letter) of a man I knew (who was afterwards to take a high place in political life), and, after giving my own view of him, quoting Carlyle's:—'He is a calm, immovable man, very learned and very active in mind.' . . . 'Carlyle says "he is a melancholy, mournful man, like an old ruined barn filled with owlets;" but I think the mournfulness is Carlyle's own, who takes a mournful view of everything.'

The effect of low spirits in lowering Carlyle's estimates of mankind may be the more clearly seen by comparison with those he formed at an earlier and healthier season—a short one unfortunately, lasting only from 1815, when he was nineteen years of age, till 1818, when he says: 'I was beginning my four or five most miserable, dark, sick and heavy-laden years. I was without experience or connection in the sphere of human business, was of shy humour, proud enough and to spare, and had begun my long curriculum of dyspepsia which has never ended since.'¹⁰ Before that gloomy after-life had set in, the spirit in which Carlyle regarded his fellow-creatures was by no means generally uncharitable. In his walks he

lodged with shepherds who had clean solid cottages; wholesome eggs, milk, oat-bread, porridge, clean blankets to their beds, and a great deal of human sense and unadulterated natural politeness. Canny, shrewd, and witty fellows when you set them talking. . . . No sort of peasant labourers I have ever come across seemed to me so happily situated, morally and physically well developed, and deserving to be happy, as those shepherds of the Cheviots. O fortunatos nimium! But perhaps it is all altered not a little now, as *I sure enough am who speak of it.*¹¹

No doubt; and had he happened to see the same peasants again after the alteration in himself, whether or not *they* had undergone alteration, he would probably have spoken of them in an altered tone.

Nor is it only in the class in which he was born that he found at this earliest and undiseased period of his life much to be pleased with. In one of his expeditions he came across a Mr. Campbell and his sisters, 'of a superior richly furnished stratum of society;' Mr.

¹⁰ Vol. i. p. 141.

¹¹ Vol. i. pp. 135-6.

Campbell 'practical and most polite,' and his sisters 'excellent lean old ladies, with their wild Highland accent, wire-drawn but genuine good manners, and good principles.'¹² And the friends and companions of these happier years wore an ever bright aspect to his eyes, in after life, clouded only by pity for their afflictions or sorrow for their death.

Irving, though it is rather nominally than actually that he is the subject of a volume, is of course the most conspicuous in the groups; and, in order to understand the depth and ardour of which Carlyle was capable in his personal attachments, it is above all necessary to trace the course of his relations with Irving in each of their several stages and under the influence of the varying circumstances belonging to each. But whilst the portion of *Reminiscences* to which Irving's name gives a title, supplies the necessary clue, the narration is so entangled with undergrowths and intersected by cross-roads, that something more than merely reading it through is necessary to get any distinct conception of what the friendship was and of what it went through in the story of its life.

I will endeavour to give it a more clear and consecutive effect, and if I should succeed, I think it will be apparent that Carlyle, under all the trials of time and circumstance, never lost hold of his great love for Irving, and never for more than a passing moment lost sight of the inborn qualities of Irving's noble and generous nature; retaining, even at the parting of the ways and in moments when sympathy was impossible, some colours of the radiant admiration which had sprung up in the dawn and daybreak of the friendship.

In their youthful and cheerful life at Kirkcaldy from 1815 to 1818 there was no strain put upon Carlyle's sympathies. Each was peculiarly fitted to be the other's companion, by force of genius, by intellectual and literary tastes, and, what is perhaps still more pertinent to the charms of companionship, by a sense of humour.

The first change of circumstances was when in 1818 they both threw up the occupation of schoolmaster at Kirkcaldy and went on a venture to Edinburgh. In Carlyle's case the change from a small but certain income earned by dull but quiet labour, to a haphazard income to be earned how he could, may have had something to do with the change to gloom and ill-health which followed. Irving was sanguine by temperament. Carlyle was not.

Irving's voice (he says) was to me one of blessedness and new hope. He would not hear of my gloomy prognostications; all nonsense that I should never get out of these obstructions and impossibilities; the real impossibility was that such a talent, &c., should not cut itself clear one day. He was very generous to everybody's 'talent,' especially to mine; which to myself was balefully dubious, nothing but bare scaffold poles, weather-beaten corner-pieces of perhaps a 'potential talent,' even visible to me. His predictions of what I was to be flew into the completely

¹² Vol. i. pp. 130-1.

incredible; and, however welcome, I could only rank them as devout imaginations and quiz them away. 'You will see now,' he would say, 'one day we two will shake hands across the brook, you as first in literature, I as first in divinity; and people will say, "Both these fellows are from Annandale. Where is Annandale?"' This I have heard him say more than once, always in a laughing way, and with self-mockery enough to save it from being barrenly vain.¹³

The next change was a separation, but a separation in place of abode only, Irving going to Glasgow to be an assistant to Dr. Chalmers. Intercourse by visits and correspondence never ceased, and the relations between them were the same as before.

The third change was a serious one for Irving and a sad one for Carlyle. In 1821 the good repute which Irving had established for himself at Glasgow brought him an invitation to London, and he accepted the ministry in Hatton Garden. The 'hurly-burly of business' attending the arrangements was hardly over when there came upon him what Carlyle calls his 'flaming popularity, spreading, mounting without limits; and, instead of business hurly-burly, there was whirlwind of conflagration:—in which whirlwind the intercourse between the friends went to wreck. Carlyle looked and longed for the accustomed letters in vain. 'In some sense,' he says, 'I had lost my friend's society (not my friend himself ever) from that time.' He was hurt and mortified and indicates a suspicion that his pride as well as his love had been wounded by Irving's silence, and that there had been a lurking jealousy as well as a sense of neglect. For Carlyle, if occasionally severe in his judgment of others, is, in his gloomier moods of self-inquisition, not very charitable towards himself. No doubt it was not with altogether unmixed feelings that he regarded his friend's popularity, the news of which reached him in such 'vague, vast, fitful and decidedly *fuliginous* forms,' and which had made Irving for a time 'the property of all the world rather than of his friends;' but his love for Irving was unabated and his spleen spent itself upon Irving's worshippers and the nature of the homage they rendered:—'For though there were beautiful items in his present scene of life, a great majority under specious figure were intrinsically poor, vulgar and importunate.'³

This sadness of silence was not to last for more than a few months. Irving, though ceasing to write, had not been forgetful of his friend, and the proof of care and remembrance given in providing him with Charles Buller for a pupil did much to reassure Carlyle and soften his feelings of separation. But when the enthusiasm which Irving had created carried him further and further into the wilderness, it was not the separation only which Carlyle regarded with regret; for he was disturbed by doubtful forecasts of what would come of it to Irving. Still, so long as all that he saw was seen from a distance, and Irving himself was joyful and triumphant, he could feel a genuine satisfaction in his friend's success.

¹³ Vol. i. pp. 187-8.

It was when Carlyle went to London in 1824 that a severer trial was to come. He then found himself in personal contact with Irving himself and with his preachings and popularities, and his friend seemed to him 'nothing like so happy as in old days; inwardly confused, anxious, dissatisfied; though as it were denying it to himself, and striving, if not to talk big, which he hardly ever did, to *think* big upon all this. . . . Happiness, alas, he was no more to have, ever, even in the old measure, in this world!' And as Irving wandered into wilder and darker regions, Carlyle traced his erratic courses to inordinate aspirations, and a noble but not unambitious belief that he was himself to be the apostle of a new Christianity throughout the world. Nevertheless, whilst the delusion, and the swarming admirers and enthusiasts who ministered to it, were sad subjects to contemplate, there was a large measure of attributes left in Irving to be contemplated with sympathy and a loving appreciation:—

He had much quiet seriousness, beautiful piety and charity, in this bad time of agitation and disquietude, and I was often honestly sorry for him. Here was still the old true man, and his new element seemed so false and abominable. Honestly, though not so purely sorry as now—now when element and man are alike gone, and all that was or partook of paltry in one's own view of them is also mournfully gone!

Carlyle's own condition during the ten months he spent in London (from June 1824 to March 1825) was less than ever favourable to seeing things on their bright side.

The accursed lag Dyspepsia had got me bitted and bridled, and was ever striving to make my waking living day a thing of ghastly nightmares. I resisted what I could; never did yield or surrender to her; but she kept my heart right heavy, my battle very sore and hopeless.

And it can now be understood what he meant when he said that, from the time Irving went to London, he had '*in some sense*' lost his friend's 'society.' They met frequently in London, but with a still diminishing freedom of communication, owing only to the pulpit popularity—

the smoke of that foul witches' cauldron; there was never anything else to blame; Irving was sorrowfully occupied in scanning and surveying the *wrong* side of that immense popularity, the outer or right side of which had been so splendid and had given rise to such sacred and glorious hopes. The crowd of people flocking round him continued in abated but still superabundant quantity and vivacity, but was not of the old high quality any more. The thought that the Christian religion was again to dominate all minds and the world to become an Eden by his thrice blessed means, was fatally declaring itself to have been a dream, and he could not consent to believe it such,—never he! That was the secret of his inward *quasi*-desperate resolutions; out into the wild struggles and clutchings towards the unattainable, the unregainable, which were more and more conspicuous in the sequel. He was now, I gradually found, listening to certain interpreters of prophecy, thinking to cast his own great faculty into that hopeless quagmire along with them.

And in this stage of Irving's career Carlyle took leave of him, and,

having nothing more to do in London, betook himself to a farm called Hoddam Hill in Annandale.

Hitherto the widening distance between the friends had grown out of religious divergences in Irving alone; but henceforth there was to be a religious change in Carlyle. In his solitary life at Hoddam Hill, and while Irving was plunging into more and more unfathomable depths, Carlyle was to rise into ethereal altitudes. Neither before nor after this period does it appear that Carlyle, when denouncing the creed of his friend, intimated what creed, if any, he would propose to substitute. Hitherto the negative and destructive forces seemed exclusively at work. And even now what part the affirmative and constructive had to play is much of a mystery.

I lived very silent, diligent, had long solitary rides . . . my meditations, musings and reflections were continual; my thoughts went wandering (or travelling) through eternity, through time and through space, so far as poor I had scanned or known, and were now to my endless solacement coming back with tidings to me! This year I found that I had conquered all my scepticisms, agonising doubttings, fearful wrestlings with the foul and vile mud-gods of my epoch; had escaped as from a worse than Tartarus, with all its Phlegethons and Stygian quagmires, and was emerging free in spirit into the eternal blue of ether, where, blessed be Heaven! I have for the spiritual part ever since lived, looking down upon the welterings of my poor fellow-creatures in such multitudes and millions still stuck in that fatal element. . . . I had in effect gained an immense victory, and for a number of years had, in spite of nerves and chagrins, a constant inward happiness that was quite royal and supreme. . . . Nowhere can I recollect of myself such pious musings, communings silent and spontaneous with Fact and Nature, as in these poor Annandale localities. The sound of the kirk-bell once or twice on Sunday mornings from Haddan Kirk, about a mile off on the plain below me, was strangely touching, like the departing voice of eighteen hundred years.

No one who knew Carlyle, least of all Irving, could fail to rejoice at the personal enfranchisement and illumination, so triumphantly announced; but if no substance of doctrine was brought to light along with it, it would be of little avail to turn Irving from the error of his ways or bridge over the gulf between them; and if Irving knew no more (and it does not appear that he knew anything) of Carlyle's new religion than is thus announced, he would learn as little of any articulate beliefs from Carlyle, as Carlyle learnt from 'the tongues' which were soon to break out in the Irvingite congregations, and which, five or six years later, Carlyle had an opportunity of overhearing in Irving's back drawing-room. And although the lights from Heaven which burst upon him in 1826 remained with him forty years later, when he wrote his *Reminiscences*, there is no revelation from first to last from which his 'poor weltering fellow-creatures' can divine what he did believe and what he did not.

Carlyle had a certain 'harsh kind of sorrow' about Irving, and a consciousness growing more bitter that each was losing his hold of the other, as the hostilities and contentions Irving was provoking grew more wild and tempestuous; but he made no attempt to save him

in this stage of his journey downwards, and felt that 'for the present it was better to be absolved from corresponding with him.'

The next stage was in 1827, when Carlyle was married and living at Edinburgh, whither Irving came on some religious errand, and in the midst of troubles, haste, and controversy, paid Carlyle and his wife a visit of half an hour, but seemed much changed, and before he went away insisted upon praying with them, much against their will, and left them with a dreary impression that they were 'not a little divorced from him and bidden to shift for themselves.'

This, however, was but one of the vicissitudes through which the friendship had to pass. When Irving next came to Scotland he stayed with Carlyle for a day or two at Craigenputtoch; and this time, being on a mission which involved him in no struggles or controversies, he was in an easy and cheerful mood; the friends found themselves, on some points at least, in accord; 'he was quite alone with us, and franker and happier than I had seen him for a long time;' and 'it was beautiful summer weather, pleasant to saunter in with old friends in the safe green solitudes, no sound audible but that of our own voices, and of the birds and trees.'

Their next meeting was not till 1831, and the scene was in London. By that time the prophesyings and 'the tongues' had been let loose in all their raving extravagances, and Irving, riding on the whirlwind, having become a scare to the Scotch Church, had been indignantly cast out of its pale. The meeting between the friends, however, was quiet; Irving was 'brotherly as ever' in his reception of Carlyle, and they spoke without reserve on the religious question. The result of course was that they found the division between them more and more hopeless, more and more sorrowful; and Carlyle, whilst intimating that the friendship stood its ground, and that they were both anxious it should do so, ascribes to Irving, as the nobler of the two in friendship, the larger share in the reconciling element.

In the course of the winter the crazy antics which the weaker brethren gave way to led to a division amongst the Irvingites themselves, and there were brawlings and riots in their own church. Carlyle looked upon it all with profound grief, but with anger too. That it should have been with anger as well as grief, is to be deplored; but is it always to be assumed that with the more anger there is the less love? I think not; and, at all events, when Carlyle had relieved his feelings by telling Irving plainly what he thought, and his expostulations had been met 'in a style of modesty and of friendly magnanimity which nobody could surpass,' the anger was all gone, and there was nothing left but a sad anticipation of the end to come, with the feeling 'How are the mighty fallen!' When the fall was so soon after into the grave, there remained a most loving remembrance of all they had been to each other in their happier days,

of all they had continued to be when their ways lay unhappily asunder, and of all that they never ceased to be till parted by death.

Such is the story to be educed, or rather extricated, from the strange, rambling, sometimes confused but often luminous and always sincere narrations, which occupy almost entirely one volume of the *Reminiscences*. And I have dwelt upon it at some length because I am anxious that those who are indignant (justly I admit) with some occasional disparagements which have seen the light they ought never to have seen, should be led themselves to exercise the charitable judgment they find to have been occasionally clouded by misanthropic moods in Carlyle, and, on a survey of the evidence afforded by the *Reminiscences* as a whole, give him credit for the great and enduring love and the genial sympathies and admirations of which he was capable, and in which in his better days he abounded, and do their endeavour to forget the instances in which his sad and solitary musings took a taint of moroseness.

I have little to say of the second volume. It is occupied for the most part with a funereal commemoration of his wife, sometimes passionate, sometimes prosaic; the threnodies interrupted by long tracts of genealogical and other details which he must have known to be so wholly uninteresting to any reader unconnected with the family, that there is perhaps in no part of the *Reminiscences* stronger evidence that they were not meant to be read by others. His tributes to the attractions and virtues of his wife, and his penitential reflections upon himself and his relations with her, may seem to point in the other direction; but repeated as they are again and again in almost identical terms, they are more likely to have been mere ejaculations for the relief of his mind from an intolerable burden.

Of the lady thus commemorated such an interesting and charming account has been given by Mrs. Oliphant,¹⁴ whose intimacy with her was far beyond what I could claim, that it would be idle for me to follow in her steps. My meetings with Mrs. Carlyle were chiefly in a country house where so many eminent persons were accustomed to assemble that she would naturally be more disposed to listen than to talk, and I knew more of her powers of conversation from what has been told me by others than from personal experience. I had ample opportunities of appreciating Carlyle's own powers in that kind; and as, in opposing my own to his estimate in the cases of Wordsworth and Coleridge, I have produced contemporary notes of the impressions made upon me, I am glad to be able to do the like by Carlyle himself. They were put together in a work intended for posthumous publication and privately printed three or four years ago; and I have the more satisfaction in quoting them, as, owing to an accidental occurrence, they came to Carlyle's knowledge. A common friend of his and mine happened to have the book in her

¹⁴ In *Macmillan's Magazine* for April.

hands when he paid her a visit, and he asked if he might be allowed to see it. She naturally referred the question to me; and though I had doubts as to the reception it would meet with at his hands, I did not like to find myself saying of him behind his back what I would not be prepared to say to his face, and I gave my consent. My doubts were soon dissipated, for in returning the book to our friend he told her he had been greatly pleased, and that 'sometimes I had been much too flattering, though in describing his characteristics I was sometimes quite out.' The passage is the last of a series of sketches of eminent men with whom I had been acquainted, and with it I conclude what I have to say of Carlyle and his *Reminiscences*.

. . . I have reserved to the last place—why I know not, unless it be on the principle that the last should be first and the first last—one with whom England, Scotland, and Germany have almost as intimate and as friendly an acquaintance as I can claim for myself—Thomas Carlyle: and yet the acquaintance I can claim is very intimate and most friendly.

His relations with the people are without a precedent, as far as I am aware, in these times or in any; the human paradox of the period. He is their 'chartered libertine,' assailing them and their rights, insisting that they should be everywhere ruled with a rod of iron, and yet more honoured and admired by them than any demagogue who pays them knee-worship. In courting the people it is easy, no doubt, to err on the side of obsequiousness, and to lose their respect. But it is far from easy to defy them, and yet to conquer. How the conquest has been achieved by Carlyle is a perplexing problem. Is it that the man being beyond all question a genuine man, there is nevertheless something unreal about his opinions; so that the splendid apparitions of them are admired and applauded by the people, as they would admire a great actor in the character of Coriolanus and another in the character of Menenius Agrippa, and still more an actor who could play both parts in turn?

But then it may be asked, how are we to reconcile the undoubted sincerity of the man, with the questionable reality of the opinions? And it is the solution of this problem which, to my apprehension, discloses the peculiar constitution of Carlyle's mind.

He is impatient of the slow processes by which most thoughtful men arrive at a conclusion. His own mind is not logical; and, whilst other eminent writers of his generation have had perhaps too much reverence for logic, he has had too little. With infinite industry in searching out historical facts, his way of coming by political doctrines is sudden and precipitate. What can be known by insight without conscious reasoning, or at least without self-questioning operations of the reason, he knows well, and can flash upon us with words which are almost like the 'word which Isaiah the son of Amos

saw. But when he deals with what is not so to be known, being intolerant of lawful courses, and yet not content with a negative, or passive, or neutral position, he snatches his opinions, and holds them as men commonly do hold what they have snatched, tenaciously for the moment, but not securely. And thence comes the sort of unreality of opinion which I have ventured to impute to the most faithful and true-hearted of mankind.

An unlimited freedom of speech is permitted to his friends, and I remember when some wild sentiments escaped him long ago, telling him that he was an excellent man in all the relations of life, but that he did not know the difference between right and wrong. And if such casualties of conversation were to be accepted as an exposition of his moral mind, any one might suppose that these luminous shafts of his came out of the blackness of darkness.

Perhaps, too, he is a little dazzled by the reflex of his wildfire, and feels for the moment that what is so bright must needs show forth what is true; not recognising the fact that most truths are as dull as they are precious; simply because in the course of ages they have worked their way to the exalted, but not interesting, position of truisms.

He was one of the most valued and cherished friends of Lady Ashburton; and as he and I were both in the habit of paying her long visits in the country (at Bay House, Alverstoke, when she was Lady Harriet Baring, at the Grange when her husband had succeeded his father), I had opportunities of knowing him such as London cannot provide. And from Bay House I find myself writing of him to Miss Fenwick thus (January 22, 1848):—

We have had Carlyle here all the time,—a longer time than I have hitherto seen him for. His conversation is as bright as ever, and as striking in its imaginative effects. But his mind seems utterly incapable of coming to any conclusion about anything: and if he says something that seems for the moment direct, as well as forcible, in the way of an opinion, it is hardly out of his mouth before he says something else that breaks it in pieces. He can see nothing but the chaos of his own mind reflected in the universe. Guidance, therefore, there is none to be got from him; nor any illumination, save that of storm-lights. But I suppose one cannot see anything so rich and strange as his mind is without gaining by it in some unconscious way, as well as finding pleasure and pain in it. It is fruitful of both.

And I wrote in the same sense to Aubrey de Vere:—

As to the rest of the people we have had at Alverstoke, some of them were agreeable, but none interesting except Carlyle, who from time to time threw his blue lights across the conversation. Strange and brilliant he was as ever, but more than ever adrift in his opinions; if opinions he could be said to have; for they darted about like the monsters of the solar microscope, perpetually devouring each other.

I did not mean to imply, of course, that he had not, what he has made known to all the world that he had in a superlative degree,

divers rooted predilections and unchangeable aversions. Both are strong in him; whether equally strong, it is not easy to say. There have been eminent men in all ages who have combined in different measures and proportions the attributes of idolater and iconoclast. They are undoubtedly combined in Carlyle; the former perhaps predominating in his writings, the latter in his conversation. What was unaccountable was that such a man should have chosen as the object of his idolatry, 'iste stultorum magister'—Success. Long before his life of Cromwell came out, I heard him insisting in conversation upon the fact that Cromwell had been throughout his career invariably successful; and having with much satisfaction traced the long line of his successes from the beginning to the end, he added, 'it is true they got him out of his grave at the Restoration and stuck his head up over the gate at Tyburn,—but not till he had quite done with it.'

He would scarcely have sympathised with the sentiment to which the last breath of Brutus gave utterance,—

I shall have glory by this losing day
More than Octavius and Mark Antony
By their vile conquest shall attain unto—

and the vile Conqueror Frederick could engage more of his admiration than most honest men will be disposed to share. Perhaps, however, it was a waning admiration,—less as he proceeded with his history than when he began it; and it should not be forgotten that he ended by entitling it a life of Frederick 'called' the Great.

His powers of invective and disparagement, on the other hand, are exercised in conversation sometimes in a manifest spirit of contradiction and generally with an infusion of humour, giving them at one time the character of a passage of arms in a tournament or sham fight, at another that of a grotesque dance of mummers; so that, forcible as they often are, they are not serious enough to give offence.

He delights in knocking over any pageantry of another man's setting up. One evening at the Grange a party of gentlemen, returning from a walk in the dusk, had seen a magnificent meteor, one which filled a place in the newspapers for some days afterwards. They described what they had beheld in glowing colours and with much enthusiasm. Carlyle, having heard them in silence to the end, gave his view of the phenomenon:—

'Aye, some sulphuretted hydrogen, I suppose, or some rubbish of that kind.'

In his invectives as well as in effusions when it would be less unexpected, there would generally be something which met the eye. When he spoke of a thing, under whatever feeling or impulse, he seemed to see it. He paid a visit to Lord Ashburton at a shooting box in Scotland, at a time when the cholera was supposed to be

approaching, and there was a retired physician staying in the house to be ready for any emergency. Carlyle was not well, and was very gloomy, and shut himself up in his room for some days, admitting no one. At last Lady Ashburton was a little disturbed at his ways, and begged Dr. Wilson just to go in to him and see whether there was anything seriously amiss. The Doctor went into his room, and presently came flying out again; and his account was that Carlyle had received him with a volley of invectives against himself and his whole profession, saying that 'of all the sons of Adam they were the most eminently unprofitable, and that a man might as well pour his sorrows into the long hairy ear of a jackass.' As in most of his sallies of this kind, the extravagance and the grotesqueness of the attack sheathed the sharpness of it, and the little touch of the picturesque,—the 'long hairy ear,'—seemed to give it the character of a vision rather than a vituperation.

HENRY TAYLOR.

THE INCOMPATIBLES.

CONCLUDED.

‘SIR, it is proper to inform you that *our measures must be healing.*’ The Irish Land Bill is now before the world, and it is easy enough, no doubt, to pick holes in its claim to be called *healing*. The Irish chafe against the connexion with this country; they are exasperated with us; they are, we are told, like wolves ready to fly at the throat of England. And their quarrel with us, so far as it proceeds from causes which can be dealt with by a Land Act—their quarrel with us is for maintaining the actual land-system and landlords of Ireland by the irresistible might of Great Britain. The grievance which they allege against the land-system and landlords is twofold; it is both moral and material. The moral grievance is that the system and the men represent a hateful history of conquest, confiscation, ill-usage, misgovernment, and tyranny. The material grievance is that it never having been usual with the landowner in Ireland, as it is in England, to set down his tenant in what may be called a completely furnished farm, the Irish tenant had himself to do what was requisite; but, when he had done it, it was the landlord’s property, and the tenant lost the benefit of it by losing his farm.

As to the material grievance there is no dispute. As to the moral grievance, it is urged on our side that ‘the confiscations, the public auctions, the private grants, the plantations, the transplantations, which animated,’ says Burke, ‘so many adventurers to Irish expeditions,’ are things of the past, and of a distant past; that they are things which have happened in all countries, and have been forgiven and forgotten with the course of time. True; but in Ireland they have not been forgiven and forgotten; and a fair man will find himself brought to the conservative Burke’s conclusion, that this is mainly due to the proceedings of the English incomers, with whom their ‘melancholy and invidious title’ of grantees of confiscation was for so long a favourite, and who so long looked upon the native Irish as a race of bigoted savages, to be treated with contempt and tyranny at their pleasure. ‘Even the harsh laws against popery were the product,’ says Burke, ‘of this contempt and tyranny, rather than of religious zeal. From what I have observed, it is pride, arrogance,

and a spirit of domination, and not a bigoted spirit of religion, that has caused and kept up these oppressive statutes.' The memory of the original 'terrible confiscatory and exterminatory periods' was thus kept alive, and the country never settled down. However, it is urged, again, that the possessors of the soil are now quite changed in spirit towards the native Irish, and changed in their way of acting towards them. It is urged that some good landlords there always were, and that now, as a class, they are good, while there are many of them who are excellent. But the memory of an odious and cruel past is not so easily blotted out; and there are still in Ireland landlords, both old and new, both large and small, who are very bad, and who by their hardness and oppressiveness, or by their contempt and neglect, keep awake the sense of ancient, intolerable wrong. So stands the case with the moral grievance; it exists, it has cause for existing, and it calls for remedy.

The best remedy, one would think, would be a direct one. The grievance is moral, and is best to be met and wiped out by a direct moral satisfaction. Every one who considers the thing fairly will see that the Irish have a moral grievance, that it is the chief source of their restlessness and resentment, that by indirect satisfactions it is not easy to touch it, but that by such an act as the expropriation of bad landlords it would be met directly. Such an act would be a moral expiation and satisfaction for a moral wrong; it would be a visible breaking, on the part of this country and its Government, with the odious and oppressive system long upheld by their power. 'The law bears with the vices and follies of men until they actually strike at the root of order.' The vices and follies of the bad landlords in Ireland have struck at the root of order; things have gone on without real and searching cure there, until the country is in a revolutionary state. Expropriation is, say objectors, a revolutionary measure. But when a country is in a revolutionary state you must sometimes have the courage to apply revolutionary measures. The revolution is there already; you must have the courage to apply the measures which really cope with it. Coercion is a revolutionary measure. But it may be very right to apply coercion to a country in Ireland's present state; perhaps even to apply a coercion far more stringent and effectual than that which we apply now. It would be a revolutionary measure to have the bad landlords of Ireland scheduled in three classes by a Commission, and, taking twenty-five years' purchase as the ordinary selling-price of an Irish estate, to expropriate the least bad of the three classes of scheduled landlords at twenty years' purchase, the next class at fifteen years' purchase, the worst at ten years' purchase. But it would be an act justified by the revolutionary state into which the misdoing of landlords of this sort, preventing prescription and a secure settlement of things from arising, has brought Ireland. It would fall upon those who represent the ill-

doers of the past, and who are actually ill-doers themselves. And finally, it would be a moral reparation and satisfaction, made for a great and passionately-felt moral wrong, and would, as such, undoubtedly have its full effect upon the heart and imagination of the Irish people. To commute the partial ownership which the Irish tenant has in equity acquired by his improvements of the land cultivated by him for absolute ownership of a certain portion of the land, as Stein commuted the peasant's partial ownership in Prussia; to give facilities, as is now proposed, for emigration, and for the purchase of land and its distribution amongst a greater number of proprietors than at present—this, joined to the expropriation of bad landlords, is what might naturally occur to one as the simple and direct way of remedying Irish agrarian discontent, and as likely to be effective and sufficient for the purpose.

The Land Bill of the Government has provisions for furthering emigration, and provisions to facilitate the purchase of land. But the moral grievance of the Irish occupier it does not deal with at all; it gives no satisfaction to it and attempts to give none. It directs itself exclusively to his material grievance. It makes no distinction between good and bad landlords—it treats them all as alike; but to the partial ownership which the occupier has in equity acquired in the land by his improvements, it gives the force of law, establishes a tribunal for regulating and enforcing it, and does its best to make this sort of partial ownership perpetual. The desirable thing is, on the contrary, as every one who weighs the matter calmly must surely admit, to sweep away this partial ownership—to sweep away tenant-right altogether. It is said that tenant-right is an Irish invention, a remedy by which they themselves have in some degree met the wants of their own case, and that it is dear to them on that account. In legislating for them we ought studiously to adopt, we are told, their inventions, and not to impose upon them ours. Such reasoners forget that tenant-right was a mere palliative, used in a state of things where thorough relief was out of the question; tenant-right was better than nothing, but ownership is better still. The absolute ownership of a part, by a process of commutation like Stein's in Prussia, engages a man's affections far more than any tenant-right, or divided and disputable ownership in a whole. Such absolute ownership was out of the question when the Irish occupier invented tenant-right; but it would please him far better than tenant-right, and commutation might now give it to him. The Land Bill, on the other hand, adopts, legalises, formulates tenant-right, a description of ownership unfamiliar to countries of our sort of civilisation, and very inconvenient; it establishes it throughout Ireland, and, by a scheme which is a miracle of intricacy and complication, it invites the most contentious and litigious people in the world to try conclusions with their landlords as to the ownership divided between

them. I cannot think such a measure healing. A divided ownership of this kind will probably, however, no more be able to establish itself permanently in Ireland than it has established itself in France or Prussia. One has the comfort of thinking that the many and new proprietors who will, it is to be hoped, be called into being by the Purchase Clauses, will indubitably find the plan of divided ownership intolerable, and will sooner or later get rid of it.

I had recourse to Burke in the former part of these remarks, and I wish to keep him with me, as far as possible, to the end. Burke writes to Windham: 'Our politics want directness and simplicity. A spirit of chicane predominates in all that is done; we proceed more like lawyers than statesmen. All our misfortunes have arisen from this intricacy and ambiguity of our politics.' It is wonderful how great men agree. For really Burke is here telling us in another way only what we found Goethe telling us when we began to discuss these Irish matters: *the English are pedants*. The pedant, the man of routine, loves the movement and bustle of politics, but by no means wants to have to rummage and plough up his mind; he shrinks from simplicity, therefore, he abhors it; for simplicity cannot be had without thinking, without considerable searchings of spirit. He abhors simplicity, and therefore of course his governments do not often give it to him. He has his formula, his catchword, which saves him from thinking, and which he is always ready to apply; and anything simple is, from its very simplicity, more likely to give him an opening to apply his formula. If you propose to him the expropriation of bad landlords, he has his formula ready, that *the Englishman has a respect for the eighth commandment*; if you propose to him to do justice to the Irish Catholics, he has his formula, at one time, that *the sovereign must not violate his coronation oath*, at another, that *the Protestants of Great Britain are implacably hostile to the endowment of Catholicism in any shape or form*, or that *the Liberal party has emphatically condemned religious endowment*. A complicated, intricate measure is the very thing for governments to offer him, because, while it gives him the gratifying sense of taking in hand something considerable, it does not bring him face to face with a principle, does not provoke him to the exhibition of one of the formulas which, in presence of a principle, he has always at hand in order to save himself the trouble of thinking. And having this personage to deal with, governments are not much to be blamed, perhaps, for approaching their object in an indirect manner, for eschewing simplicity and choosing complication. The Irish Land Bill does not meet the moral grievance of the Irish occupier at all, and it meets his material grievance in a round-about, complicated manner, and by means that are hard upon good landlords; but it does meet it after a fashion, and in meeting it it does not challenge the presentation of any of the pedantic Englishman's stock formulas, while it effects, at the same time, some very useful

things by the way. And certainly governments which seek to compass their ends in this manner do not incur that severe condemnation which Burke passes upon ministers who make it their business 'still further to contract the narrowness of men's ideas, to confirm inveterate prejudices, to inflame vulgar passions, and to abet all sorts of popular absurdities.' No, not by any means do they deserve this formidable blame. But when Burke writes to the Duke of Richmond of that day, that without censuring his political friends, he must say that he perceives in them no regular or steady endeavour of any kind to bestow the same pains which they bestow on carrying a measure, or winning an election, or keeping up family interest in a county, 'on that which is the end and object of all elections—namely, the disposing our people to a better sense of their condition'—when Burke says this, then he says what does touch, it seems to me, both the present government, and almost all governments which come and go in this country; touches them very nearly. They acquiesce too easily in the mass of us being, as Goethe says, pedants; they are too apprehensive of coming into conflict with our pedantry; they show too much respect to its formulas and catchwords. They make no regular or sustained endeavours of [any kind to dispose us poor people to a better sense of our condition. If they acquiesce so submissively in our being pedants in politics, pedants we shall always be. We want guidance from those who are placed in a condition to see. 'God and nature never made them,' says Burke of all the pedantic rank and file of us in politics, 'to think or to act without guidance or direction.' But we hardly ever get it from our government.

And I suppose it was despair at this sort of thing in his own time and commonwealth which made Socrates say, when he was reproached for standing aloof from politics, that in his own opinion, by taking the line he did, he was the only true politician of men then living. Socrates saw that the thing most needful was 'to dispose the people to a better sense of their condition,' and that the actual politicians never did it. And quiet people at the present day, who have no Socrates to help them, may well be inclined at any rate to stand aside as he did from the movement of our prominent politicians and journalists, and of the rank and file who appear to follow, but who really do oftenest direct them—to stand aside, and to try whether they cannot bring *themselves*, at all events, to a better sense of their own condition, and of the condition of the people and things around them. The problem is to get Ireland to acquiesce in the English connexion as cordially as Scotland, Wales, or Cornwall acquiesce in it. We quiet people pretend to no lights which are not at the disposal of all the world. Probably if we were mixed up in the game of politics we should play it much as other people do, according to the laws of that routine. We do not suppose, even, that we can point out courses which politicians and newspapers, as people and parties now are, will be at

all likely to entertain. But we may be able to suggest, perhaps, courses which quiet people may think over in their minds as possible means to help us out of our difficulties, and which will remain to be tried, and to save us from despair, if the means which politicians and newspapers are now recommending, and of which the public mind is full, should prove, when they are tried, not to be successful. In this way we were led to suggest a mode of dealing with the agrarian trouble in Ireland which our politicians and newspapers are not at all likely to entertain, but which to quiet, simple people may perhaps commend itself as reasonable enough, and as offering refuge and hope if other courses, when they are tried, fail.

Meanwhile, however, let us treat the endeavours and plans of other people without pedantry and without prejudice, remembering that our one business is to see things as they really are. Ireland is to be brought, if possible, to acquiesce cordially in the English connexion; and to this end our measures must be *healing*. Now, the Land Bill of the Government does not seem to deserve thoroughly the name of a *healing* measure. We have given our reasons for thinking so; but the question is, whether it proposes so defective a settlement as to make, of itself, Ireland's cordial acquiescence in the English connexion impossible, and to compel us to resign ourselves a prey to the alarmists. One cannot without unfairness and exaggeration say this of it. It is offered with the best intentions, it deals with the material grievance of the Irish occupier if not with his moral grievance, and it proposes to do certain unquestionably good and useful things besides redressing this grievance. It will not of itself make the Irish acquiesce cordially in the English connexion. But then neither would a thoroughly good Land Bill suffice to do this. The *Pall Mall Gazette* says indeed, or did say formerly, for we will by no means oblige it to remain in a particular opinion which seems unsound—the *Pall Mall Gazette* said formerly: 'A good Land Bill will take the political bread out of Mr. Parnell's mouth.' Now Mr. Parnell maintains that he and his friends 'have the forces of nature, the forces of nationality, and the forces of patriotism' working for the separation of Ireland from England: and so they have at present. A good Land Bill will not suffice to stay and annul the working of these forces, though politicians who are busy over a Land Bill will always be prone to talk as if it would suffice to do whatever may be required. But it will not; much more than a good Land Bill is necessary in order to annul the forces which are working for separation. The best Land Bill will not reduce to impotence the partisans of separation, unless other things are accomplished too; the present Land Bill is not so defective as that it need prevent cordial union, if these other things are accomplished.

One of them has been mentioned already in the former part of these remarks. I mean the equitable treatment of Catholicism. To many of the Liberal party it is a great deal easier to offer to Ireland

a fair Land Bill than to offer to her a fair treatment of Catholicism. You may offer as fair a Land Bill as you please ; but if, presently, when the Irish ask to have public schools and universities suited to Catholics, as England has public schools and universities suited to Anglicans, and Scotland such as are suited to Presbyterians, you fall back in embarrassment upon your formula of pedants, *The Liberal party has emphatically condemned religious endowment*, you give to the advocates of separation a new lease of power and influence, you enable them still to keep saying with truth that they have 'the forces of nature, the forces of nationality, and the forces of patriotism' on their side. 'Our measures *must be healing*,' and it is not only as to Irish land that healing measures are necessary ; they are necessary as to the Irish people's religion also.

If this were in any good measure accomplished, if, even, we offered the Land Bill which Mr. Gladstone brings forward now, and if we offered a treatment of Catholicism as well intentioned and as fair in its way, then indeed things would have a look of cheerful promise, and politicians would probably think that the grand consummation had been reached, and that the millennium was going to begin. But a quiet bystander might still be cool-headed enough to suspect that for winning and attaching a people so alienated from us as the Irish something more, even, is required than healing measures in redress of actual mis-usage and wrong ; 'their temper, too, must be managed, and their good affections cultivated.' Many of us talk as if the mere calculation of their interest, of the advantage to their commerce, industry, and security from the English connexion, must induce the Irish to blend readily with us, if they were but treated fairly. But with a people such as the Irish, and when once such a feeling of repulsion has been excited in them as we have managed to excite, the mere calculation of their interest is not sufficient to win them. They must find in us something that in general suits them and attracts them ; they must feel an attractive force drawing and binding them to us in what is called our civilisation. This is what blends Scotland and Wales with us ; not alone their interest, but that our civilisation in general suits them and they like it. This is what so strongly attached to France the Germanic Alsace, and keeps it attached in spirit still ; the wonderfully attractive power of French civilisation.

Some say that what we have in Ireland is a lower civilisation hating the advent of a higher civilisation from England, and rebelling against it. And it is quite true that certain obvious merits of the English, and by which they have much prospered, such as their exactness and neatness, for instance (to say no more than what everybody must admit), are disagreeable to Irish laxity and slovenliness, and are resisted by them. Still, a high civilisation is naturally attractive ; the turn and habits of the French have much that is insome and provoking to Germans, yet French civilisation attracted Alsace powerfully. It

behoves us to make quite sure, before we talk of Ireland's lower civilisation resisting the higher civilisation of England, that our civilisation is really high, high enough to exercise attraction.

Business is civilisation, think many of us; it creates and implies it. The general diffusion of material well-being is civilisation, thought Mr. Cobden, as that eminent man's biographer has just informed us; it creates and implies it. Not always; and for fear we should forget what business and what material well-being have to create before they imply civilisation, let us, at the risk of being thought tiresome, repeat here what we have said often of old. They are signs of expansion and parts of it; but civilisation, that great and complex force, includes much more than even that power of expansion of which they are parts. It includes also the power of conduct, the power of intellect and knowledge, the power of beauty, the power of social life and manners. To the building up of human life all these powers belong. If business is civilisation, then business must manage to evolve them; if a widely spread material well-being is civilisation, then that well-being must manage to evolve all these powers. It is written: *Man doth not live by bread alone.*

Now, one of the factors of civilisation is, without doubt, singularly absent from ours—the power of social life and manners. 'The English are just, but not amiable,' was a sentence which, as we know, even those who had benefited by our rule felt themselves moved to pass on us. We underrate the strength of this element of civilisation, underrate its attractive influence, its power. *Mansueti possidebunt terram*—the gentle shall possess the earth. We are apt to account amiability weak and hardness strong; but even if it were so, 'there are forces,' as George Sand says truly and beautifully, 'there are forces of weakness, of docility, of attractiveness or of suavity, which are quite as real as the forces of vigour, of encroachment, of violence, or of brutality.' And to those softer but not less real forces the Irish people are peculiarly sensible. They are full of sentiment, they have by nature excellent manners themselves, and they feel the charm of manners instinctively. 'Courtesy,' says Vauvenargues, 'is the bond of all society, and there is no society which can last without it.' If courtesy is required to cement society, no wonder the Irish are estranged from us. For we must remember who it is of us that they mostly see, who and what it is that in the main represent our civilisation to them. The power of social life and manners, so far as we have it, is in Great Britain displayed above all in our aristocratic class. Mr. Carlyle's tribute to the politeness to be found amongst them, and to the great value of it, will be fresh in our minds: 'With due limitation of the grossly worthless, I should vote at present that, of classes known to me in England, the aristocracy (with its perfection of human politeness, its continual grace of bearing and of acting, steadfast "honour," light address, and cheery stoicism), if you see

well into it, is actually yet the best of English classes.' But our aristocracy which have, on Mr. Carlyle's showing, this power of manners so attractive to the Irish nature, and who in England fill so large a place, and do really produce so much effect upon people's minds and imaginations, the Irish see almost nothing of. Its members who are connected with Ireland are generally absentees. Mr. Lecky is disposed to regret very much this want in Ireland of a resident aristocracy, and says that the Irish people are by nature profoundly aristocratical. At any rate, it is capable of feeling strongly the attraction of the power of manners in an aristocracy, and with an aristocracy filling the place there which it fills in Great Britain, Ireland would no doubt have been something very different from what it is now. While I admit, however, the merits of our aristocracy, while I admit the effect it produces in England and the important place it fills, while I admit that if it were resident in Ireland we should probably have Ireland in another and a more settled state, yet I do not think that a real solution would have been thus reached there any more than it has been reached, I think, here. I mean, if Ireland had had the same social system as we have, she would have been different from her present self indeed, but sooner or later she would have found herself confronting the same difficulty which we in England begin to feel now; the difficulty, namely, that the social system in question ends by landing modern communities in the happy possessorship of an upper class materialised, a middle class vulgarised, a lower class brutalised. But I am not going to discuss these matters now. What I want now to point out is, that the Irish do not much come across our aristocracy, exhibiting that factor of civilisation, the power of manners, which has undoubtedly a strong attraction for them. What they do come across, and what gives them the idea they have of our civilisation and of its promise, is our middle class.

I have said so much about this class at divers times, and what I have said about it has made me so many enemies, that I prefer to take the words of anybody rather than myself for showing the impression which this class is likely to make, and which it does make, upon the Irish, and the sort of idea which they form of the attractions of its civilisation for themselves, or for mankind in general, or for any one except us natives of Great Britain. There is a book familiar to us all, and the more familiar now, probably, to many of us, because Mr. Gladstone solaced himself with it after his illness, and so set all good Liberals (of whom I wish to be considered one) upon reading it over again. I mean *David Copperfield*. Much as I have published, I do not think it has ever happened to me before to comment in print upon any production of Charles Dickens. What a pleasure to have the opportunity of praising a work so sound, a work so rich in merits, as *David Copperfield*! *Man lese nicht die mit-strebende, mit-wirkende*, says Goethe: do not read your fellow-strivers, your fellow-workers. Of the contem-

porary rubbish which is shot so plentifully all round us, we can, indeed, hardly read too little. But to contemporary work so good as *David Copperfield*, we are in danger of perhaps not paying respect enough, of reading it (for who could help reading it?) too hastily, and then putting it aside for something else and forgetting it. What treasures of gaiety, invention, life, are in that book! what alertness and resource! what a soul of good-nature and kindness governing the whole! Such is the admirable work which I am now going to call in evidence.

Intimately, indeed, did Dickens know the middle class; he was bone of its bone and flesh of its flesh. Intimately he knew its bringing up. With the hand of a master he has drawn for us a type of the teachers and trainers of its youth, a type of its places of education. Mr. Creakle and Salem House are immortal; the type itself, it is to be hoped, will perish, but the drawing which Dickens has given of it cannot die. Mr. Creakle, the 'stout gentleman with a bunch of watch-chain and seals, in an arm chair,' with the fiery face and the thick veins in his forehead; Mr. Creakle sitting at his breakfast with the cane, and a newspaper, and the buttered toast before him, will sit on, like Theseus, for ever. For ever will last the recollection of Salem House, and of 'the daily strife and struggle' there; the recollection

of the frosty mornings when we were rung out of bed, and the cold, cold smell of the dark nights when we were rung into bed again; of the evening schoolroom dimly lighted and indifferently warmed, and the morning schoolroom which was nothing but a great shivering machine; of the alternation of boiled beef with roast beef, and boiled mutton with roast mutton; of clods of bread and butter, dog-eared lesson-books, cracked slates, tear-blotted copy-books, canings, rulerings, hair-cuttings, rainy Sundays, suet-puddings, and a dirty atmosphere of ink surrounding all.

A man of much knowledge and much intelligence, who died not long ago, Mr. Baring Gould, shortly before his death published a book about Germany, in which he gave testimony which in a curious manner proves how true and to the life this picture of Salem House and of Mr. Creakle is. The public schools of Germany come to be spoken of, and the training which the whole middle class of Germans gets in them; and Mr. Gould mentions what is reported by young Germans trained in their schools, who have afterwards served as teachers of foreign languages and ushers in the ordinary private schools for the middle class in England. With one voice they tell us of establishments like Salem House and principals like Mr. Creakle. They are astonished, disgusted; they cannot understand how such things can be, and how a great and well-to-do class can be content with such an ignoble bringing up; but so things are, and they report their experience of them, and their experience brings before us, over and over again, Mr. Creakle and Salem House.

A critic in the *World* newspaper says, what is very true, that in

this country the middle class has no naturally defined limits, that it is difficult to say who properly belong to it and who do not, and that the term is taken in different senses by different people. This is most true, and therefore, for my part, to prevent ambiguity and confusion, I always have adopted an educational test, and by the middle class I understand those who are brought up at establishments which are more or less like Salem House, and by educators who are more or less like Mr. Creakle. And the great mass of the middle part of our community, the part which comes between those who work with their hands, on the one side, and people of fortune, on the other, is brought up at establishments of the kind, though there is a certain portion broken off at the top which is educated at better. But the great mass are badly taught, and brought up on a lower plane than is right, brought up ignobly. And this deteriorates their standard of life, their civilisation. True, they have at the same time great merits, of which they are conscious themselves, and of which all who are in any way akin to them, and disposed to judge them fairly and kindly, cannot but be conscious also. True, too, there are exceptions to the common rule among the establishments and educators that bring them up; there are good schools and good schoolmasters scattered among them. True, moreover, amongst the thousands who undergo Salem House and Mr. Creakle, are some born lovers of the humane life, who emerge from the training with natures unscathed, or who at any rate recover from it. But, on the mass, the training produces with fatal sureness the effect of lowering their standard of life and impairing their civilisation. It helps to produce in them, and it perpetuates, a defective type of religion, a narrow range of intellect and knowledge, a stunted sense of beauty, a low standard of manners. And this is what those who are not akin to them, who are not disposed to be friendly observers of them, really see in them. This is what the Celtic and Catholic Irish see in them. The Scotch of the Lowlands, of far the most populous and powerful part of Scotland, are men of just the same stock as ourselves, and breed Murdstones as naturally as we do. Wales is Celtic, but the Welsh have adopted with ardour the Murdstonian religion, and this at once puts them in sympathy with our middle-class civilisation. With the Irish it is different. English civilisation means to the Irish the civilisation of our middle class, and few indeed are the attractions which to them, with their quickness, sentiment, fine manners, and indisposition to be pleased with things English, that civilisation seems to have. They do not see the exceptions in our middle class; they do not see the good which is present even in the mistreated mass of it. All its members seem of one type of civilisation to an Irish eye, and that type a repulsive one. They are all tarred with one brush, and that brush is Creakle's.

We may even go further still in our use of that valuable and

instructive book, the *History of David Copperfield*, and may lay our finger on the very types in adult life which are the natural product of Salem House and of Mr. Creakle, the very types of our middle class, pay of Englishmen and the English nature in general, as to the Irish imagination they appear. We have only to recall, on the one hand, Mr. Murdstone, with his firmness and severity; with his austere religion and his tremendous visage in church; with his view of the world as 'a place for action, and not for moping and droning in;' his view of young Copperfield's disposition as 'requiring a great deal of correcting, and to which no greater service can be done than to force it to conform to the ways of the working world, and to bend it and break it.' We may recall, too, Miss Murdstone, his sister; with the same religion, the same tremendous visage in church, the same firmness, with her 'uncompromising hard black boxes with her initials on the lids in hard black nails,' her 'hard steel purse,' and her 'numerous little steel fetters and rivets'; severe and formidable like her brother, 'whom she greatly resembled in face and voice.' These people, with their hardness, their narrowness, their want of consideration for other people's feelings, their inability to enter into them, are just the type of the Englishman and his civilisation as he presents himself to the Irish mind by his serious side. His energy, industry, religion, exhibit themselves with these unpleasant features; his bad qualities exhibit themselves without mitigation or relief. Now Murdstone may be called the natural product of a course of Salem House and of Mr. Creakle acting upon hard, stern, and narrow natures. A disposition to hardness is perhaps the special fault and danger of our English race in general, going along with our merits of energy and honesty. It is apt even to appear in all kinds and classes of us, when the circumstances are such as to call it forth. One can understand Cromwell himself, whom we earnest English Liberals reverentially name 'the great Puritan leader,' standing before the Irish imagination as a glorified Murdstone; and the late Lord Leitrim, again, as an aristocratical Murdstone. Mr. Bence Jones, again, improver and benefactor as he undoubtedly is, yet takes a tone with the Irish which may not unnaturally, perhaps, affect them much as Murdstone's tone affected little Copperfield. But the genuine, unmitigated Murdstone is the common middle-class Englishman, who has come forth from Salem House and Mr. Creakle. He is seen in full force, of course, in the Protestant north, but throughout Ireland he is a prominent figure of the English garrison. Him the Irish see, see him too much and too often; and he represents to them the promise of English civilisation on its serious side, what this civilisation accomplishes for that great middle part of the community towards which the masses below are to look up and to ascend, what it invites those who blend themselves with us to become and to be.

The thing has no power of attraction. The Irish quick-wittedness,

sentiment, keen feeling for social life and manners, demand something which this hard and imperfect civilisation cannot give them. Its social form seems to them unpleasant, its energy and industry to lead to no happiness, its religion false and repulsive. A friend of mine who lately had to pursue his avocations in Lancashire, in the parts about St. Helens, and who has lately been transferred to the west of Ireland, writes to me that he finds with astonishment that 'even in the farthest *ultima Thule* of the west, amongst literally the most abjectly poverty-stricken cottiers, life appears to be more enjoyed than by a Lancashire factory-hand and family who are in the receipt of five pounds a week, father, mother, and children together, from the mill.' He writes that he finds 'all the country people here so full of courtesy and graciousness!' That is just why our civilisation has no attractions for them. So far as it is possessed by any great body in our own community, and capable of being imparted to any great body in another community, it has no courtesy and graciousness, it has no enjoyment of life, it has the curse of hardness upon it. The penalty nature makes us pay for hardness is dulness; if we are hard, our life becomes dull and dismal. Our hardness grows at last weary of itself; in Ireland, where we have been so hard, this has been strikingly exemplified. Again and again, upon the English conqueror in his hardness and harshness, the ways and nature of the down-trodden, hated, despised Irish, came to exercise a strange, an irresistible magnetism. 'Is it possible,' asks Eudoxus, in Spenser's *View of the State of Ireland*, 'is it possible that an Englishman, brought up in such sweet civility as England affords, should find such liking in that barbarous rudeness that he should forget his own nature and forego his own nation?' And Spenser, speaking under the name of Ireneus, answers that unhappily it did indeed happen so. The Protestant Archbishop Boulter tells us, in like manner, that under the iron sway of the penal laws against Popery, and in the time of their severest exercise, the conversions from Protestantism to Popery were nevertheless a good deal more numerous than the conversions from Popery to Protestantism. Such, I say, is nature's penalty upon hardness; it grows irksome to itself, it ends by wearying those who have it. If our hardness is capable of wearying ourselves, can we wonder that a civilisation stamped with it has no attractions for the Irish; that Murdstone, the product of Salem House and of Mr. Creakle, is a type of humanity which repels them, and that they do not at all wish to be like him?

But in Murdstone we see English middle-class civilisation by its severe and serious side. That civilisation has undoubtedly also its gayer and lighter side; and this gayer and lighter side, as well as the other, we shall find, wonderful to relate, in our all-containing treasure-house of the *History of David Copperfield*. Mr. Quinion, with his gaiety, his chaff, his rough coat, his incessant smoking, his

brandy and water, is the jovial, genial man of our middle class civilisation, prepared by Salem House and Mr. Creakle, as Mr. Murdstone is its severe man. Quinion was not precisely and literally Murdstone's partner, for Grinby, we are told, was his partner; but Quinion was his manager, and is truly his pendant. He is the answer of our middle-class civilisation to the demand in man for beauty and enjoyment, as Murdstone is its answer to the demand for temper and manners. To a quick, sentimental race, Quinion can be hardly more attractive than Murdstone. He produces our towns considered as seats of pleasure, as Murdstone produces them considered as seats of business and religion. As it is Murdstone, the serious man, whose view of life and demands on life have made our *Hell-holes*, and the dissidence of dissent and the Protestantism of the Protestant religion, and the refusal to let Irish Catholics have schools and universities suited to them because their religion is *a lie and heathenish superstition*, so it is Quinion, the jovial man, whose view of life and demands on it have made our popular songs, comedy, art, made the City Companies and their feasts, made the London streets, made the Griffin. Nay, Quinion has been busy in Dublin too, for have we not conquered Ireland? The streets and buildings of Dublin are full of traces of him; his sense of beauty governed the erection of Dublin Castle itself. As the civilisation of the French middle class is the maker of the streets and buildings of modern Paris, so the civilisation of the English middle class is the maker of the streets and buildings of modern London and Dublin.

Once more. Logic and lucidity in the organising and administering of public business are attractive to many; they are satisfactions to that instinct of intelligence in man which is one of the great powers in his civilisation. The immense, homogeneous, and (comparatively with ours) clear-thinking French middle class prides itself on logic and lucidity in its public business. In our public business they are conspicuous by their absence. Our public business is governed by the wants of our middle class, and is in the hands of public men who anxiously watch those wants. Now our middle class cares for liberty; it does not care for logic and lucidity. Murdstone and Quinion do not care for logic and lucidity. Salem House and Mr. Creakle have not prepared them for it. Accordingly, we see the proceedings of our chief seat of public business, the House of Commons, governed by rules of which one may at least say, without risk of being committed for contempt, that logic and lucidity have nothing to do with them. Mr. Chamberlain, again, was telling us only the other day that 'England, the greatest commercial nation in the world, has in its bankruptcy law the worst commercial legislation of any civilised country.' To be sure, Mr. Chamberlain has also said that if in England we fall behind other nations in the intelligent appreciation of art, we minister to a hundred wants of which the other nations have no suspicion.' As we are a commercial people, one would have thought

that logic and lucidity in commercial legislation was one of these wants to which we minister; however, it seems we do not. But, outside our own immediate circle, logic and lucidity are felt by many people to be attractive; they inspire respect, their absence provokes ridicule. Probably the Irish themselves, though they are gainers by it, laugh in their sleeve at the pedantries and formalities with which our love of liberty, Murdstone and Quinion's love of liberty, and their total want of instinct for logic and lucidity, embarrass our attempts to coerce them. Certainly they must have laughed outright, being people with a keen sense of the ridiculous, when in the information to which the traversers had to plead at the late trials, it was set forth that the traversers 'did conspire, combine, confederate, and agree together, to solicit, incite, and procure,' and so on. We must be Englishmen, countrymen of Murdstone and Quinion, loving liberty and a 'freedom broadening slowly down from precedent to precedent;' not fastidious about modern and rational forms of speech, about logic and lucidity, or much comprehending how other people can be fastidious about them, to take such a jargon with proper seriousness.

The dislike of Ireland for England the resistance of a lower civilisation to a higher one! Why, everywhere the attractions of this middle-class civilisation of ours, which is what we have really to offer in the way of civilisation, seem to fail of their effect. 'The puzzle seems to be,' says the *Times* mournfully, 'where we are to look for our friends.' But there is no great puzzle in the matter if we will consider it without pedantry. Our civilisation, as it looks to outsiders, and in so far as it is a thing broadly communicable, seems to consist very much in the Murdstonian drive in business and the Murdstonian religion, and in the Quinionian joviality and geniality. Wherever we go, we put forward Murdstone and Quinion, and call their ways civilisation, and our governing class nervously watch their ways and wishes, and back up their civilisation all they can, but it does not prove attractive. The English in South Africa will all be commercial gentlemen, says Lady Barker, their wives will be ladies, they will not even tend poultry. The English in the Transvaal, we hear again, contain a wonderful proportion of attorneys, speculators, land-jobbers, and persons whose antecedents will not well bear inspection. Their recent antecedents we will not meddle with, but one thing is certain: their early antecedents were those of the English middle class in general. They have almost all, we may be sure, passed through the halls of a Salem House and the hands of a Mr. Creakle. They have the stamp of Murdstone or Quinion. Indeed we are so prolific, so enterprising, so world-covering, and our middle class and its civilisation so entirely take the lead wherever we go, that there is now, one may say, a kind of odour of Salem House all round the globe. It is almost inevitable that Mr. Sprigg should have been reared in some such establishment; it is ten to one that Mr. Berry is

an old pupil of Mr. Creakle. And when they visit Europe, no doubt they go and see Mr. Creakle, where he is passing the evening of his days in honourable retirement, a Middlesex magistrate, a philanthropist, and a member of the Society of Arts. And Mr. Berry can tell him of a happy country all peopled by ourselves, where the Murdstone and Quinion civilisation seems to men the most natural thing in the world and the only right civilisation, and gives entire satisfaction. But poor Mr. Sprigg has to report of a land plagued with a large intermixture of foreigners, to whom our unique middle class civilisation does not seem attractive at all, but they find it entirely disagreeable. And so, too, to come back much nearer home, do the Irish.

So that if we, who are in consternation at the dismal prophecies we hear of what is in store for Ireland and England, if we determine to perish, as I say, in the light at any rate, to abjure all self-deception, and to see things as they really are, we shall see that our civilisation, in its present state, will not help us much with the Irish. Even if we gave them really healing measures, yet still, estranged as they now are, it would be further necessary to manage their tempers and cultivate their good affections by the gift of a common civilisation congenial to them. But our civilisation is not congenial to them. To talk of it, therefore, as a substitute for perfectly healing measures is ridiculous. Indeed, the pedantry, bigotry, and narrowness of our middle class, which disfigure the civilisation we have to offer, are also the chief obstacle to our offering measures perfectly healing. And the conclusion is, that our middle class and its civilisation require to be transformed. With all their merits, which I have not now much insisted upon because the question was how their demerits make them judged by unfriendly observers—with all their merits, they require, as I have so often said, to be transformed. And for my part I see no way so promising for setting about it as the abolishment of Salem House and of Mr. Creakle. This initiatory stage governs in a great degree all the rest, and with this initiatory stage we should above all deal. *He has got on his old hobby again!* I think I hear people saying. Really they ought rather to commend the strictly and humbly practical character of my writings. It was very well for Mr. Carlyle to bid us have recourse, in our doubts and miseries, to earnestness and reality, and veracity and the everlasting yea, and generalities of that kind; Mr. Carlyle was a man of genius. But when one is not a man of genius, and yet attempts to give counsel in times of difficulty, one should be above all things practical. Now our relations with Ireland will not in any case be easily and soon made satisfactory, but while our middle class is what it is now they never will. And our middle class, again, will not be easily and soon transformed, but while it gets its initiation to life through Salem House and Mr. Creakle, it never will. The great thing is to initiate it to life by means of public schools. Public schools for

the middle classes are not a panacea for our ills, but they are the indispensable preliminary to our real improvement on almost all the sides where as a nation we now move with embarrassment. If the consideration of our difficulties with Ireland had not, like so much else, brought me at last full upon this want which is capital, but far too little remarked, I should probably not have ventured to intrude into the discussion of them. However terrified and dejected by the alarmists, I should have been inclined to bear my burden silently in that upper chamber in Grub Street, where I have borne in silence so many sorrows. I know that the professional people find the intervention of outsiders very trying in politics, and I have no wish to provoke their resentment. But when the discussion of a matter tends inevitably to show the crying need which there is for transforming our middle-class education, I cannot forbear from striking in; if I do not speak of the need shown, nobody else will.

Yet the need is, certainly, great and urgent enough to attract notice; but then the middle class is very strong and self-satisfied, and every one flatters it. It is like that strong and enormous creature described by Plato, surrounded by obsequious people seeking to understand what its noises meant, and to make in their turn the noises which might please it. At best palliatives are now and then attempted, as there is a company, I believe, at this moment projected to provide better schools for the middle classes. Alas! I should not be astonished to find presently Mr. Creakle himself among the directors of a company to provide better schools for the middle classes, and the guiding spirit of its proceedings, so far as his magisterial functions, and his duties on philanthropical committees and on committees of the Society of Arts, permit him to take part in them. But oftener our chief people take the bull by the horns, and actually congratulate the middle class on the character and conditions of its education. And so they play the part of a sort of spiritual panderer to its defects and weaknesses, and do what in them lies to perpetuate them. Lord Frederick Cavendish goes down to Sheffield to address an audience almost entirely trained by Salem House and Mr. Creakle, and the most suitable thing he can find to say to them is, he thinks, to congratulate them on their energy and self-reliance in being so trained. But this is an old story, a familiar proceeding, for which the formula has long since been given: namely, that the upper class do not want to be disturbed in their preponderance, nor the middle class in their vulgarity. But if we wish cordially to attach Ireland to the English connexion, not only must we give healing political measures, we must also, and that as speedily as we can, transform our middle class and its social civilisation.

I perceive that I have said little of faults on the side of the Irish, as I have said little of the merits which accompany, in our middle class, their failure in social civilisation; and for the same reason—

because the matter in hand was the failure on our part to do all in our power to attach Ireland, and how to set about remedying the failure. But as I have spoken with so much frankness of my own people and kindred, the Irish will allow me, perhaps, to end with quoting three queries of Bishop Berkeley's, and with recommending them to their attention :—

1. Whether it be not the true interest of both nations to become one people, and whether either be sufficiently apprised of this ?

2. Whether Ireland can propose to thrive so long as she entertains a wrong-headed distrust of England ?

3. Whether in every instance by which the Irish prejudice England, they do not in a greater degree prejudice themselves ?

Perhaps, also, they might do well to perpend the good bishop's caution against 'a general parturiency in Ireland with respect to politics and public counsel ;' a parturiency which in clever young Irishmen does often, certainly, seem to be excessive. But, after all, my present business is not with the Irish but with the English—to exhort my countrymen to healing measures and an attractive form of civilisation. And if our countrymen insist upon it that attractive their form of civilisation is, or ought to be, then we who think differently must labour diligently to follow Burke's injunctions, and to 'dispose people to a better sense of their condition.'

MATTHEW ARNOLD.

*THE DUKE OF ARGYLL AND THE
IRISH LAND BILL.*

THE retirement of the Duke of Argyll from the Government, and his separation from colleagues with whom he has been associated throughout his political career, is at once the subject of universal regret to Liberals, and the strongest testimony to the strength of his objections to the proposed land legislation for Ireland, so cogently expressed in his article of last month. Although in the interval the Land Bill has been fully discussed in the House of Commons, it may be worth while to deal with these objections more specifically than has yet been done, with a view to the consideration they are likely to receive in the Upper House, where they will have most weight, and may influence the fate of the measure.

The tone, however, of the article is so temperate and fair, and so much is conceded, that we may hope the Duke's treatment of the measure when it reaches the Lords will not be of a very destructive character; his attitude may probably be not different from that of the present Lord Chancellor, who, under somewhat similar circumstances, refused office in 1869 under Mr. Gladstone, rather than be a party to the Disestablishment of the Irish Church. This did not, however, prevent him joining the Ministry after the passing of a measure which his personal feelings and regard for consistency disabled him from supporting, but which his statesmanship recognised as inevitable.

It is, indeed, evident that the Duke of Argyll admits in the fullest manner the necessity of reopening the question of Irish Land Legislation, which it was hoped the Act of 1870 had finally determined. Like many others, he shows an unexpected and somewhat tardy interest in the development of the policy for multiplying ownerships among the occupiers of land in Ireland by means of State assistance and loans. He is prepared to go a long way in this direction, with the object of bringing into existence a class of small owners, who may prove a support and prop to the rights of property. He thinks, however, that the clauses of the Bill which have this object are contradictory to those which give further security to existing tenants; and he fears that so much is conceded to tenants under

these other parts of the measure, that there will be little inducement to them to undertake the small increase of present burthen which will convert them into owners. It is true that the two parts of the Bill proceed on different lines—the one aiming at the spread of full ownership among the occupying class, the other placing restrictions upon existing ownerships in favour of the occupying tenants; and to whatever extent the latter is a full remedy for the grievances complained of, the tenants may be less inclined to avail themselves of the former. These objects, however, are supplementary rather than antagonistic to one another. It is impossible that any scheme for promoting ownership among occupying tenants can be otherwise than gradual in its operation, unless we are prepared to adopt the principle of expropriation, or to offer terms so favourable as to give rise to an universal demand for the expropriation of landlords. What answer then is it to tenants whose interests are being absorbed and appropriated by a rack-renting landlord, that on a neighbouring property more favoured tenants have been assisted in becoming owners? On the other hand, whatever may be the extent of protection accorded to the tenants by the Bill, there will still remain a vast disproportion between the number of tenants on the one side and the number of landlords on the other; it is most desirable therefore that the ranks of the latter should be greatly reinforced, and that the class of persons ordinarily tenants should be largely infused with those who have the interest and instincts of owners. The terms offered by the Bill to tenants desirous of purchasing have evidently been framed so as to give such inducements to occupying tenants as will result in a considerable accession of them to the class of owners, but not such as to result in agitation for the universal application of the scheme. It is obvious, therefore, that even if this part of the measure should have all the success its friends desire, and should result in a very considerable addition to the number of occupying owners, it is no remedy for the wider evils which have led to the demand for legislation, and which are at the root of the agitation in Ireland.

The question, then, remains—What is to be done in respect of the much larger class who must still remain tenants, and who cannot avail themselves of the opportunities and assistance for becoming owners, or where owners are unwilling to sell? What also is the evil, and what is the extent and effect of it? The defect of the Duke of Argyll's argument is, that, while admitting the necessity of certain legislation, which goes a long way in a direction opposed to all preconceived doctrines, he appears not to appreciate the facts which alone can justify it. He admits the expediency of some intervention of the State to prevent excessive rents, but he justifies this departure on the ground only 'that exceptional poverty or weakness justify some unusual or temporary protection,' and he seems to be quite unaware of the nature and extent of the evils which have led to the present state

of things. Elsewhere, alluding to increments of rent at frequent and at uncertain intervals as a great evil, he adds, 'but it is not an evil which has been shown to prevail at all extensively, or against which violent remedies are required.' This raises a question of fact, and must be decided upon reference to the evidence. It turns also in great part upon another question of fact, on which the Duke has also come to an opinion different in a great measure from that of most of those who hold legislation to be necessary and defensible, and a right and full understanding of which is necessary before we can appreciate the effect upon the tenant's interest of the arbitrary raising of rent—namely, the extent to which tenants in Ireland have themselves effected improvements upon their holdings. Throughout the whole of the article there is no sufficient appreciation of the fact that the tenants as a rule have effected all improvements and that the landlords have done little or nothing.

'If there is one fact,' he says, 'brought out more clearly than another by the evidence taken before the Commission, it is the large and unacknowledged share which landowners have frequently contributed to the improvements of Ireland.' This is not, I think, the conclusion which will result from a careful study of the evidence of both Commissions. On the contrary, the general effect of the evidence is to confirm in the fullest manner the common opinion, that substantially throughout Ireland, whatever may be said to distinguish the land from the uncultivated waste or bog, whatever there is of building or farmstead, or of drains and fences, has been effected by tenants and not by landlords. There are exceptions to this; there are individual cases where landowners such as Lords Fitzwilliam and Leconfield, Mr. Mahoney of Dromore, Mr. Crosbie of Ardfert, and others, have acted on the English plan—have effected improvements at their own cost, and have erected farm buildings; but these are few and far between: they do not interfere with the general result. This indeed is no new view of Ireland; it was stated in the broadest terms in the Report of the Devon Commission in 1844. After speaking of the state of England, it said:—

In Ireland the case is wholly different. It is admitted on all hands that, according to the general practice in Ireland, the landlord builds neither dwelling-house nor farm-houses, nor puts fences, gates, &c., into good order before he lets his land to a tenant. In most cases, whatever is done in the way of building or fencing is done by the tenant; and, in the ordinary language of the country, dwelling-houses, farm buildings, and even the making of fences, are described by the general word 'improvements,' which is thus employed to denote the necessary adjuncts to a farm without which in England or Scotland no tenant could be found to rent it.

After quoting this before the Commission of last year, Mr. M. O'Brien, the valuator and surveyor of the Irish Temporalities Commission, who has had unusual opportunities of inspecting properties in every part of Ireland, said:—

That expresses what is now the general case of Ireland. Of course there are properties where landlords spend money. There are particular farms on estates where landlords do spend money. It is by agreement with the tenant. It has suited them both, but it certainly would not be remunerative to the landlord to do it in a general way; but I don't think he has done it, or ever does it, as a rule.¹

The majority also of the Duke of Richmond's Commission speak of the 'improvements and equipments of farms in Ireland as very generally the work of the tenant.'

A committee of Irish landowners, it is true, have put forth an imposing array of figures with the object of showing the expenditure of landlords on a considerable number of properties. They allege that in respect of 4,200,000 acres of which they have been able to obtain information, and which probably represent the property of the larger and highest class of owners, 3,542,000*l.* has been spent by the landlords in from thirty to forty years: when the figures are worked out, it appears that an average of about 1*l.* per acre has been spent, spread over forty years, or at the rate of 2½ per cent. of the rent in each year. It further appears that more than one half of this expenditure was provided for by loans from the State for drainage, in respect of which the tenants paid the interest and instalments of capital, and cannot therefore be said to have been provided by the landowners.

An interesting illustration is afforded by the evidence before the Duke of Richmond's Commission of the way in which these figures are made up, and how Irish landowners may persuade themselves that they have effected vast improvements on their tenants' holdings. A landowner, in arguing against the claims of the tenants, alleged that in the past twenty-five years he had himself expended no less than 150,000*l.* upon his estate of 20,000 acres. When cross-examined it appeared that, of this great amount, all that was laid out for the benefit of the tenant was about 10,000*l.*, of which 5,400*l.* was on drainage (for which the tenant paid interest), and 3,150*l.* on buildings; the remainder had been spent in planting and beautifying his demesne lands, or in other directions which could in no way be counted as improvements of the tenants' holdings.² Even without deduction for exaggerations of this kind, the return of the Landowners' Committee confirms rather than refutes the general statement that the Irish landowners have not materially contributed to the improvement of their tenants' holdings. In some cases they have provided slates and timber for building, and tiles for drainage; but even this aid, it is alleged, has been withdrawn since the Land Act of 1870. It will be found that nearly all the leading land-agents who gave evidence before the Bessborough Commission speak of the Act as having checked landlords' assistance to tenants' improvements. The Act having recognised the right of the

¹ Duke of Richmond's Commission, q. 22213.

² Duke of Richmond's Commission, qq. 25639-54.

tenants to their improvements, it is said that the landlords hesitate to contribute the slates or timber, the value of which might not be very appreciable in the shape of interest and rent, but would go to swell the tenants' claims for compensation on leaving their farms.

It should never be forgotten, however, that there is an economic cause for the improvements being effected by the tenant rather than by the landlord, where a system of agriculture exists such as that of Ireland. The landlord cannot make improvements, build houses and farm buildings, and maintain them after the English fashion, for a vast number of small holdings varying from 5 to 50 acres. He has not the capital to do so, if he has the will, nor would it be wise on his part to attempt it. The tenant can effect such improvements at much less cost than the landlord; his own labour enters largely into the matter; he knows best what he wants. The landlord who should be disposed to undertake this work for his tenants would have no peace, and but a small proportion of his rent would find its way to his banker. In England, under a system of large farms, it is different; the economic argument, equally with the general practice, may be in favour of the landlord supplying the capital necessary to equip the farm with buildings and to maintain them, leaving the tenant free to use his capital in his business as farmer, rather than lock it up in permanent improvements; but the result of the English system is, that the drain upon the capital of the landlord is very heavy, not merely for new buildings and other improvements, but for maintenance and repairs.

A change of tenancy is the almost certain cause of a demand upon the landlord to put the farm buildings in order. The labourers' cottages are also at his charge, and it is notorious that capital expended on them, even when new, seldom gives a return of more than 1 per cent. The expenditure in improvements and maintenance on a well-managed property in England seldom averages less than 15 per cent. of the income, and of this but a small part brings any return in the shape of interest or increased rent. It is probable that in most parts of England from one-third to one-half of the interest of the landlord in his land consists of his own and his predecessors' investments of capital in it, and the remainder only is the natural value of the land unimproved. In Ireland the reverse is the case; throughout its length and breadth the landlords and their predecessors, with rare exceptions, have done and can do but little or nothing. On this point the evidence of Mr. R. V. O'Brien, agent to Lord Inchiquin's estates in Clare, is very much to the point:—

At present (he says), the landlords in Ireland have hardly sufficient capital to make the improvements which are necessary to make the farms habitable and easily cultivated by the people; and it is very difficult for them to do so on account of the size of the farms. When there are 200 acres taken up by ten farms, the Commission can understand that building farmsteads for ten farms of 20 acres is a

very different thing from building a farmstead for one farm of 200 acres. Even with the best intention, I do not think that any landlord can afford to build farmsteads for so many small holdings.

How could the tenant be in a better position in that respect?

He can work much cheaper and he can do it as he pleases himself; he has his own horse, and he has his own time for doing these things; and I find that he works for about half the expense that the landlord does.³

Under the present conditions, therefore, of Ireland, it is no subject for blame that the landlords have not effected improvements, but have left them to the tenants. Inasmuch, however, as tenants can only be expected to make improvements when they have ample security for them, those landlords are much to blame who have not given this security. The very fact, also, that the tenants are expected to make these improvements, and to maintain them, and that they can effect this at a cheaper rate and more advantageously than the landlords can do, entirely alters their relation to the land and to their landlords; they look upon the land they have improved, and upon the houses they have built, with very different regard to that of the mere capitalist in the English sense of the term. In the latter the landowner has never lost dominion over the land, and has continuously exercised the function of owner. In the former the tenants have put their labour and capital into the land, and have acquired what must necessarily seem to them a permanent interest in it. Given, therefore, a general system of small holdings, not largely intermixed and supported by ownerships as in France and Belgium, but associated with universal tenancy, it is certain that the status of the tenant must be greatly affected by it, and that a claim will grow up for the recognition of rights totally different from anything that has been claimed by or conceded to the English tenant.

It is difficult to point out in the civilised world a single case similar to that of Ireland, where a very general system of small holdings exists, unsupported by a widely distributed ownership, or where the occupiers have not claimed and attained a right to continuity of holding, such as to give them security for their cultivation and improvements, and inducement to industry, leavened with content and respect for the law. It may be recollected that the Roman law, the justest system of jurisprudence which has ever been promulgated by man, recognised under similar circumstances the right to a perpetuity of a tenant who by himself or his predecessors had paid rent for forty years. We have ourselves been compelled to recognise the same principle in India, where, under the legislation of 1859, a continuous holding for only twelve years entitles the ryot to a perpetual occupancy, subject to revision of rent by a legal tribunal. The numerous cases distributed throughout Europe of perpetual tenancies at fixed rents, subject to fines on alienation or

³ Duke of Richmond's Commission, q. 28389, *et seq.*

bequest, are illustrations of the same kind: they were originated, on the example of the Roman law, by the ecclesiastical owners of such lands when, freeing in early times the cultivators from serfdom, it became necessary to determine the nature of their tenure. The necessary distinction, then, between the economic condition of the Irish small holdings and the English large holdings—between the Irish peasant cultivator and the English capitalist farmer—is the fundamental principle which must be conceded before any step can be taken towards land legislation in Ireland.

It may be said by many, perhaps, that, looking broadly at the two systems, the English system of large holdings and capitalist tenant, and of separation of the rural community into three distinct classes of owner, tenant, and labourer, is economically sounder and better than the Irish system of two classes only—of owner and peasant cultivator. The question is too large to discuss fully in this paper; it is scarcely necessary to do so; he would be a bold man who should proclaim that it is the duty of England to impress its system upon Ireland, and legislate with a view to the suppression of small tenancies and the conversion of their tenants into labourers. The merits of the English system are by no means clear; it is very exceptional; it is not certain that it will stand the test of adversity; the condition of the agricultural labourer under it is far from satisfactory.

We must then accept the Irish system as it is, and make the best of it; it is more in harmony with the general conditions of other civilised communities in Europe than is the system of England, and all experience shows that it is compatible with a cultivation vastly better than that which exists in Ireland, and with a prosperity and content which unfortunately are now absent; and there can be little doubt that this absence is due to the want of security to the tenants' capital, which a widely-distributed ownership or a fuller system of tenant-right would supply. It is certain that this conflict of two systems, and the instinct of the Irish people that English law and English ideas endeavour to force upon them a system opposite to their own, alien to their traditions, and contrary to their ideal of happiness and civilisation, have much to do with the bitterness, and even ferocity, with which the Land Question is surrounded. Ireland is, and for all legislative purposes must be, considered and treated as a country of small cultivators. Such as it is, it is capable of vast improvement. It is our duty, then, to make the conditions such that the system may be tried under the best advantages, and we must cast aside all idea of shaping its laws so as to facilitate or promote the substitution there of the English system. It is in this respect that it seems to me the Duke of Argyll fails throughout his article. His ideals are those of the English and Scotch system; he evidently thinks the Irish system unsound; he admits the necessity of some remedies, but they are temporary and transitional; he looks

